



1949

An Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom with Special Reference to Selected Homilies on the Gospel According to St. Matthew

Henry A. Toczydlowski
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

 Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Toczydlowski, Henry A., "An Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom with Special Reference to Selected Homilies on the Gospel According to St. Matthew" (1949). *Master's Theses*. 702.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/702

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1949 Henry A. Toczydlowski

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SELECTED HOMILIES
ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW

by

Henry A. Toczydlowski

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of Master
of Arts in Loyola University

June

1949

LIFE

Henry A. Toczydlowski was born in Chicago, Illinois, October 20, 1917.

He was graduated from Quigley Preparatory Seminary, Chicago, Illinois, June, 1935, and from St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Illinois, June, 1941, with the degree of Master of Arts, and of Licentiate of Sacred Theology. He was ordained priest by His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch, May 3, 1941.

He began teaching Latin and Greek at Quigley Preparatory Seminary in September, 1943. He began his graduate studies at Loyola University in March, 1945.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
PROLOGUE. THE LIFE OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM	5
Birth at Antioch in year 347 -- Education and baptism in 369 -- A monk for six years -- Ordination to the priesthood in 386 and beginning of preaching -- The Affair of the Statues -- Archbishop of Constantinople in 398 -- Eutropius -- Synod of The Oak in 403 -- Chrysostom banished and recalled -- Exile II in 404 -- Death at Comana, in Pontus, September 14, 407.	
I. THE WRITINGS OF CHRYSOSTOM	24
Treatises, homilies, discourses -- Texts and translations -- His influence -- Object of thesis -- Language of homilies -- Classical influence on Chrysostom -- Exegetical methods -- Date and place of composition -- Content.	
II. THE HOMILY	44
Classic division of oratory -- Species of sacred oratory -- The homily: types and plan -- The appeal of the homily: <u>ut veritas pateat</u> , <u>ut placeat</u> , <u>ut moveat</u> .	
III. "UT PATEAT"	56
Unity: How achieved -- How achieved by Chrysostom -- Coherence: Relation of thoughts -- Expression of relationship -- Examples from Chrysostom -- Clearness: Requisites for -- Satisfied by Chrysostom.	
IV. "UT PLACEAT"	78
Not out of place in a homily -- Variety: Devices and Chrysostom -- Interest: Means -- Use by Chrysostom -- Beauty: Figures of sound -- Figures of thought -- Chrysostom.	

V. "UT MOVEAT" 110

Importance in oratory -- Appeal to the passions -- Secured
by Emphasis: Mechanics of emphasis -- Illustrated from
Chrysostom -- Vigor: direct and indirect pathetic -- Ac-
cumulation -- Exemplified in Chrysostom -- Movement:
Climax -- Chrysostom.

VI. CONCLUSION 139

Chrysostom's success due to ethos, fluency of language,
profuse illustration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY 145

APPENDIX 149

PROLOGUE

THE LIFE OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

Of the sixteen cities founded in Asia by Seleucus Nicator, the most famous was Antioch in Syria. In the fourth century it was the second city of the Eastern part of the Roman empire. It was a magnificent city of colonnaded streets and gardens, of luxurious houses and public buildings, of baths and places of amusements, famous for its show girls and dancers and actors. Here lived the governor of the Syrian province, here was the center of Asiatic commerce and wealth, here beat the heart of Greek civilization and culture. Here St. Paul had taught, here the followers of Christ were first called οἱ Χριστιανοί; ¹ here many martyrs gave witness to the Gospel.² Here in the fourth century Pagans, Manichaeans, Gnostics, Arians, Apollinarians, Jews were desperately proselytizing. Here the Catholics themselves were separated by the schism between the bishops Meletius and Paulinus. And here, about the year 347, into this troubled scene was born John, later surnamed Chrysostom.³ His father, Secundus,

¹ "And it was in Antioch that the disciples were first called 'Christians.'" The New Testament--Revised Challoner-Rheims Version. Edited by The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (Paterson, New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1941) P. 347.

² Including St. Ignatius, the second bishop of Antioch, martyred in Rome.

³ It appears he was not so designated during his lifetime; the first recorded use of it is by Pope Vigilius in 553.

was a high-ranking officer⁴ in the Syrian army, but died soon after⁴ John was born. Anthusa, his mother, was then a young woman of twenty, and took sole charge of her two children, John and an elder sister. From his mother he received an admirable Christian training, and despite the dangers to morals and religion she sent him to the best schools in Antioch for his course of classical studies: grammar, poetry, rhetoric, and philosophy. From Andragatius⁵ he learned philosophy; for rhetoric he went to Libanius, the most famous rhetorician of the period and also a devoted adherent of the pagan cause.⁶ John's natural genius so impressed the famous orator that on his deathbed he would have named Chrysostom as his successor, "if the Christians had not stolen him."⁷

After a brilliant course of studies, John for some time pleaded at the bar. The turning-point of his life was his meeting with Bishop Meletius of Antioch who spoke to the young man about his religious life, and persuaded him that he could use his wonderful powers of speech to much greater advantages in pleading God's cause in the churches, than in dealing with cases of justice in the courts of law. Chrysostom was then twenty, and after two years of sacred studies was baptised c. 369. He and his friend

4 στρατηλάτης

5 Socrates, Historia Ecclesiastica, VI, 3 (Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, LXVII, col. 666).

6 John E. Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship (2nd edition, London: Cambridge, University Press, 1906), p. 354.

7 Sozomenus, Historia Ecclesiastica, VIII, 2 (Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, LXVII, col. 1513): εἰ μὴ Χριστιανοὶ ἐσῴλησαν αὐτόν.

Basil decided to become monks.⁸ His mother objected strenuously. Chrysostom describes the incident in his *Περὶ Ἱερωσύνης*:

For when she perceived that I was deliberating on this project, she took me by the hand and brought me into her own room, and making me sit down by the bed where she gave me birth, she burst into . . . tears. . . .

My dear son, said she, as God so willed it, I was not allowed to possess long your virtuous father. For his death, which took place soon after you were born, left you an orphan and me prematurely a widow. . . . No words can describe the flood of affliction which a young woman, who has but recently left her father's house, and is yet inexperienced in business, endures when she is suddenly overwhelmed with extreme grief and compelled to undertake cares beyond her age and sex. For she is obliged to correct the domestics for their negligence, and watch to hinder their infidelity, and guard against the intrigues of relatives, and resist courageously the exactions and harshness of the tax-gatherers. . . .⁹

She went on to describe how the difficulties and anxieties are increased if there is a son to bring up,

. . . to say nothing of the expense she is obliged to incur in her desire to give him a liberal education. Yet none of these things induced me . . . to bring a second husband into your father's house. . . . And it was no small consolation to me in those trials to look frequently on your countenance and to possess in you a true and living likeness of the deceased. . . . Nor can you blame me and say that . . . I wasted your paternal estate owing to the hardships of widowhood. . . . For I have preserved it unimpaired, though I spared no expense necessary to give you a liberal education, drawing for that purpose on my own property and on the dowry I brought from my father's house.¹⁰

Finally she said:

⁸ In the fourth century there were thousands of these monks. They were solitaries [*μοναχός* from *μόνος*] living in total seclusion from the world in some more or less remote place, spending their time in religious contemplation, and in the practice of penance, sometimes giving themselves over to the most fantastic austerities. But they made a deep impression on Christians living in the midst of a society where corruption was open and appalling.

⁹ Chrysostom, *Περὶ Ἱερωσύνης* Bk. I, 5. Quotation from translation *On the Priesthood of St. John Chrysostom* by Patrick Boyle (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Book Shop, 1943), pp. 3-4.

¹⁰ Boyle, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

And do not imagine that I say this by way of reproach, but for all this I ask you for only one favour: do not make me once more a widow, nor awaken a grief that has been stilled. Await my death; perhaps in a short time I shall pass away. . . . When you have laid me in the earth, by the bones of your father, then set out on long pilgrimages, sail on whatever sea you please. There will be no one then to hinder you. But while I live, have patience to live with me; and do not lightly and rashly offend God by involving in so many sorrows one [who] has done you no wrong. And if you can charge me with forcing you into the cares of the world, or compelling you to manage your own affairs, respect neither the laws of nature, nor education, nor family life, nor anything else, but fly from me as from a traitor and an enemy. But if I take every means to secure to you much leisure in your passage through life, let this bond at least detain you with me.¹¹

So for two more years he remained in his mother's home. When he was nominated for the episcopal office,¹² he fled the honor, later justifying his action in the six splendid books of his dialogue Περὶ Ἱερωνύμου.

Upon the death of his mother¹³ he withdrew to the mountains south of Antioch and joined one of the loosely knit communities of hermits. According to custom he put himself under the direction of an old and experienced Syrian monk, probably Syrus by name, spending his time in theological study and prayer, following the hard and simple life of the desert.¹⁴ He seems during this retreat to have composed his work, Against the assailants of the monastic life, and The comparison between the King

¹¹ Boyle, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

¹² Boyle, op. cit., p. 5: "All the MSS. except four have τοῦ [sic] τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Four have Ἱερωνύμου."

¹³ Year 374 or 375.

¹⁴ Or, as Palladius puts it: "for four years battling with the rocks of pleasure." Palladius is the best authority on the life of Chrysostom, being an eye-witness to most of the events. The other "lives" are much inferior, i.e., those of Theodore, Bishop of Trimithus c. 680; George, Bishop of Alexandria, c. 620; the theologian Photius, c. 850; and in the fifth century church histories by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. The text of

and the Monk. After four years of this community life, he decided to become an anchorite and retired to live in a cave by himself, where he remained secluded from all society for two years. But his excessive ascetic practices, his indiscreet watchings and fastings in frost and cold, weakened his health to such a degree that he was forced by sickness to return to Antioch early in 381.

Very probably in the spring of that year Meletius made him deacon, and five years later¹⁵ he was ordained priest by Flavian I, the successor of Meletius. It was while he was yet deacon¹⁶ or in the beginning of his priesthood that he wrote the *Περὶ Ἰερωσύνης*. With his ordination to the priesthood Chrysostom dates his real importance in ecclesiastical history. His chief task during the next twelve years was that of preaching, which he had to exercise either with or instead of Bishop Flavian. But no doubt the larger part of the popular religious instruction and education devolved upon him. Sandys adds that "he wielded by his extraordinarily eloquent discourses a far wider influence than he ever attained during his brief and troubled tenure of the patriarchate of Constantinople."¹⁷

Palladius used in connection with this thesis is a translation: The Dialogue of Palladius concerning the Life of John Chrysostom by Herbert Moore (New York: Macmillan, 1921). The Greek text of Palladius, Dialogus cum Theodore, Ecclesiae Romanae Diacono, de vita et conversatione B. Joh. Chrysostomi, is found in Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, XLVII, 5-82.

¹⁵ Year 386.

¹⁶ Socrates, op. cit., VI, 3 (Migne, op. cit., v. 67, col. 666).

¹⁷ Sandys, op. cit., p. 350.

The society in which he lived was in the main no longer heathen⁴, but not yet properly Christian. It was composed, according to Attwater,

. . . of many people living under conditions of grinding want, and many more in a state of formal slavery; of a rapacious fiscal system administered by corrupt officials; of a selfish and predatory governing class and of considerable insecurity of life and property. In addition to this there existed the constant threat to the empire from the barbarian both outside and inside its borders. But in the decay of the Roman civic organization the place of the magistrates was beginning to be taken by the Christian bishops, men generally chosen by the laity and lesser clergy, whose solicitude extended to the most obscure slave and who had the religious duty to withstand injustice and unrighteousness even in Caesar himself.¹⁸

What part the clergy were already taking in public affairs will be seen from the activity of Bishop Flavian and Chrysostom on the occasion of the popular riots that ended in the demolition of the imperial statues. It was also the earliest notable occasion in which Chrysostom's power of speaking and his great authority were shown, when he delivered a series of extempore sermons called On the Statues during the Lenten season of 387. The people of Antioch, excited by the levy of new taxes, threw down the statues of Emperor Theodosius and his family, dragged them about the streets, and broke them with every mark of contempt and indignation. When their excitement had spent itself, the people now became panic-stricken at the thought of the punishment which must inevitably follow this seditious outbreak.¹⁹

¹⁸ Donald Attwater, St. John Chrysostom (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1939), p. 2.

¹⁹ It was all too probable that the emperor would have the city burned to the ground and its inhabitants put to death. Attwater says that the only three years later Theodosius was to "commit the abominable crime of ordering the massacre of 7,000 men, women, and children at Salonika after some officials had been killed in a riot (under pressure from St. Ambrose he submitted to public penance for this)." Ibid., p. 39.

Chrysostom seized this opportunity to deliver a series of twenty or twenty-one²⁰ sermons, full of vigor, consolatory, exhortative, tranquillizing. Meanwhile Archbishop Flavian, in spite of his great age, and in spite of the serious illness of his beloved sister, followed the official envoys to Constantinople, making a journey of 700 miles on mule or horseback, in winter, through the mountains of Asia Minor, with the hope of staying the emperor's hand.²¹ This affair of the Statues was a crucial point in Chrysostom's life. His part in it carried him securely into the hearts of the people, and probably revealed to him the extent of his own powers and abilities; from this time forward he was a force, even politically, in the Eastern empire.

The usual preaching, however, of Chrysostom consisted in consecutive explanations of Holy Scripture. According to Bauer, probably the greatest authority on Chrysostom,

To that custom . . . we owe his famous and magnificent commentaries, which offer us such an inexhaustible treasure of dogmatic, moral, and historical knowledge of the transition from the fourth to the fifth century. These years, 386-398, were the period of the greatest theological productivity of Chrysostom, a period which alone would have assured him for ever a place among the first Doctors of the Church.²²

But if, as was mentioned above, the Church no longer held entirely aloof from the half-Christianized secular state and society, the emperors

²⁰ The nineteenth is probably not authentic.

²¹ An outline of Flavian's successful speech is given in the second chapter of this thesis. Infra, pp. 49-50.

²² Chrysostom Bauer, "John Chrysostom," The Catholic Encyclopedia, VIII, 453.

became ever more actively interested in the affairs of the Church. " Thus on the death of Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, in 397, the Emperor Arcadius determined to leave nothing undone to have Chrysostom named for that See. It was difficult to accomplish this, first, because of the general rivalry in the capitol for the vacant see, and, second, because the people of Antioch would be unwilling to consent to such a measure, and, finally, because Chrysostom's own humility would prompt him to decline such an honor. Hence, without the knowledge of the people, John was called on a pretext to the capitol, and elevated to the episcopacy of Constantinople on the 26th of February, 398, in the presence of a great assembly of bishops, by Theophilus, the Patriarch of Alexandria.

Bauer says:

The change for Chrysostom was as great as it was unexpected. His new position was not an easy one, placed as he was in the midst of an upstart metropolis, half Western, half Oriental, in the immediate neighborhood of a court in which luxury and intrigue always played the most prominent parts, and at the head of a clergy composed of the most heterogeneous elements, and even (if not canonically, at least practically) at the head of the whole Byzantine episcopate.²³

Constantinople was in need of reform and got it. The new bishop began "sweeping the stairs from the top."²⁴ He ordered his economus to reduce the expenses of the episcopal household to the barest minimum. Next he reformed the clergy less by rigor and the severity of his authority than by his own example. He confined all monks to their monasteries. Widows,

²³ Bauer, op. cit., p. 454.

²⁴ Quoted from Palladius in Bauer, op. cit., p. 454.

who depended for their livelihood upon the Church, either had to remarry, or, if they continued their service to the Church as deaconesses, to observe the rules of decorum demanded by their state.

After his reforms of the clergy Chrysostom turned his attention to the laity. He observed how their addiction to the circus, where gladiatorial combats still took place, and to the theatre, with its indecency and shockingly blasphemous mimes, superseded all concern for piety and religion. Against this, and against the custom of swearing and of exacting an oath on every trivial occasion, with the consequent danger of perjury, he began to preach. And a visible reformation began to take place, public amusement being abandoned for the purpose of complying with the duties of religion. He spoke often, sometimes every day; and so delighted were the people with the sermons of their new bishop, that they frequently applauded him in the church.²⁵ The unjust rich often felt his censure. He preached against their unreasonable extravagances, and especially against the ridiculous finery in dress of women whose age should have put them beyond such vanities. He pointed out that their splendid garments were spun by the worms of the earth, made by the hands of the poor artisans, and worn by persons of the vilest character; that they themselves were but clay, dust, ashes; that they possessed a command over men, but were themselves possessed by their passions.

25 See Chrysostom's own words about applause. Infra, p. 79

It seems that the upper classes of Constantinople had not been accustomed to such language. Doubtless some felt the rebuke to be intended for themselves, and the offence given was the greater in proportion as the rebuke was the more deserved. But, too, in proportion as the patricians and big businessmen and imperial courtiers waxed indignant, the common people's respect for their new archbishop increased. In his very first years he built a hospital out of what he was saving on his household expenses, and from the sale of the extensive episcopal wardrobe, the plate, the works of art, and all the other superfluities his predecessors had accumulated. Then followed other charitable institutions. Still Chrysostom had very intimate friends also among the rich and noble classes. The most famous of these was Olympias, widow and deaconess, a relation of Emperor Theodosius. The empress Eudoxia herself was at first most friendly toward the new bishop.

The feelings of amity, however, between the bishop and the empress did not last. Eutropius, a former slave, now minister and consul, abused his influence, confiscating the property of the wealthy for his own aggrandizement, and persecuting others whom he suspected of being his rivals. Time and time again the bishop went to the minister to remonstrate with him and to warn him of the results of his own acts,²⁶ but to no avail. The queen, being thus surrounded by the inimical Eutropius and resentful aristocracy, soon became estranged herself from the strict bishop, especially

²⁶ Chrysostom, Oratio ad Eutropium (Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, Chrysostomi Opera III) 392.

when Chrysostom pointed out to the queen the injustice of her act in depriving a widow of her vineyard.²⁷ Henceforth there was coolness between the imperial court and the episcopal palace, which, eventually, led to a catastrophe.

In January, 399, for reasons not exactly known, Eutropius fell into disgrace. Knowing the feelings of the people and of his personal enemies, he fled to the cathedral. Although he himself had abolished the customary right of sanctuary, yet now he sought it. The bishop found him cowering by the altar, and outside the soldiers were gathering. They demanded the surrender of the fugitive; Chrysostom refused. The soldiers threatened; finally he was marched off like a prisoner to the palace. In view of the archbishop's dignified protest Arcadius promised that Eutropius' place of refuge should be respected. The troops were furious; the populace aroused. On the next day, while Eutropius clung to one of the pillars of the altar, Chrysostom delivered the first of his two magnificent sermons entitled Pro Eutropio. He expatiated so movingly on the vanity and delusion of human greatness that his audience melted into tears, and the life of the wretched minister was saved. When night fell, Eutropius tried to escape; he was seized, exiled, and some time later put to death.

Immediately another more exciting and more dangerous event followed. Gainas, one of the imperial generals, had been sent to subdue Tribigild, who had revolted. In the summer of 399 Gainas openly united with Tribigild,

²⁷ Palladius, in Herbert Moore, op. cit., p. 71, footnote 3.

and to restore peace Arcadius had to submit to the most humiliating conditions. It was through the intervention of Chrysostom that Gainas spared many hostages. "On account of these happenings I have been away from you for a long time," preached Chrysostom afterwards, "going backwards and forwards, exhorting, beseeching, imploring, to avert the disaster threatening the authorities."²⁸ When Gainas returned to Constantinople, being an Arian, he demanded a church for himself and his soldiers. Again Chrysostom made so energetic an opposition that Gainas yielded. Meanwhile the people of Constantinople had become excited, and in one night several thousand Goths were slain. Gainas, however, escaped, was defeated, and was slain by the Huns. Such was the end, within a few years, of three consuls of the Byzantine empire. "There is no doubt," says Bauer, "that Chrysostom's authority had been greatly strengthened by the magnanimity and firmness of character he had shown during all these troubles."²⁹

In the year 400 the distracted state of ecclesiastical affairs at Ephesus and the neighboring places demanded the presence and authority of the Bishop of Constantinople. Several charges had been brought against the Bishop of Ephesus and other prelates, the leading article of accusation being simony. A council was held to adjust the situation, which appointed Heraclides, Chrysostom's deacon, to the see of Ephesus, and deposed six bishops.

²⁸ Chrysostom, Homilia cum Saturninus et Aurelianus acti essent in exsilium, et Gainas egressus est e civitate, I (Migne, op. cit., vol. 52, col. 415). N.B. Whenever reference is made to Migne without any accompanying reference to a translation, then translation is the writer's.

²⁹ Bauer, op. cit., p. 454.

Meanwhile, disagreeable things had happened at Constantinople.

Chrysostom had entrusted the care of his diocese during his absence to Bishop Severian of Gabala in Syria. But Severian occasioned difficulties in the capitol, at the same time spreading calumnies against Chrysostom, so much so that, when Chrysostom returned, he invited Severian to return to his see immediately. But the public scandal had excited much ill-feeling. This state of affairs was particularly acceptable to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, a man of turbulent, proud and revengeful disposition, who never forgot that he had been forced to renounce the idea of securing the appointment of Isidore in favor of Chrysostom.

Theophilus was still more enraged at the reception given by Chrysostom to certain Egyptian monks, known in history as the four tall brothers. The patriarch, their former friend, had suddenly turned against them and persecuted them as Origenists. Chrysostom, however, admitted them to communion after they had been juridically acquitted. They made several charges against Theophilus, who, thereupon, was summoned by the emperor to Constantinople to apologize before a synod, over which Chrysostom should preside. At this time Chrysostom delivered a sermon against the vain luxury of women. It was reported to the empress as though she had been personally alluded to. When Theophilus appeared in Constantinople in 403, not alone as he had been ordered, but with twenty-nine of his suffragan bishops, the empress invited him to take up his lodgings in one of the imperial palaces. He, thereupon, held conferences with all of Chrysostom's adversaries. Then he retired to a villa near Constantinople

called At the Oak.³⁰ An impeachment was then drawn up against the great prelate consisting of twenty-nine articles preserved by Photius.³¹ Chrysostom was now summoned to present himself and apologize. He naturally refused to recognize the legality of this pretended synod. After the third summons, his enemies pronounced a sentence of deposition against Chrysostom, and by the intrigues of Eudoxia, managed to have the emperor sanction it, and to issue an order for his banishment.

In order to avoid useless bloodshed, Chrysostom surrendered himself on the third day to the soldiers who awaited him. He preached his last sermon:

What should I fear? Death? "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." Tell me, is it banishment? "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." Is it perhaps the confiscation of my effects? We brought nothing with us into the world, we can convey nothing in our exit; the terrors of this life are deserving of my contempt, its happiness excites a smile. I fear not poverty, I covet not wealth, I dread not death, I desire not life, but for your improvement. . . .³²

The first exile of St. John lasted only a short time. After his departure, the people became so infuriated and threatening and riotous, that the queen became alarmed and ordered his recall. Chrysostom re-entered the capitol amid frantic enthusiasm. Theophilus and his party saved themselves by fleeing from Constantinople, and the Bishop addressed his flock:

What shall I say? What shall I utter? Blessed be God! . . . I gave thanks when I was expelled, I give thanks when I am come back. The conditions of summer and winter are different, but their end is the same: the fruitfulness of the earth. . . . I say these things that

30 ἐν τῷ δρυὶ

31 Photius, Bibliotheca, Cod. LIX, (Migne, op. cit., vol. 47, cols. 197-198).

32 Chrysostom, ΟΜΙΑΙΑ ΠΡΟ ΤΗΣ ΕΞΟΡΙΑΣ, 1. (Migne, op. cit. v. 52, col. 427).

I may encourage you to bless God. Do good things happen? Bless God and the good remains. Do bad things happen? Still bless God and evil is taken away. . . . The games are on today, and no one is there. . . . Who has driven the [wolves] away? Not I, the shepherd, but you, the sheep. O nobleness of the flock!³³

The empress wrote him a message that night:

I have earned a crown better than the imperial diadem itself. I have brought back the high priest; I have restored the head to the body, the pilot to the ship, the shepherd to the flock, the husband to the home. . . .³⁴

But the sunshine of imperial favor was soon obscured. Chrysostom's return was a defeat for the empress. When her alarms had gone, her rancor revived. Two months afterwards a silver statue of the empress was unveiled in the square just before the cathedral. The public celebrations on this occasion lasted several days and became so boisterous that the services in the church were disturbed. Chrysostom complained of this to the prefect of the city, who reported to Eudoxia that the bishop had complained about her statue. This was enough to excite the empress beyond all bounds. She summoned Theophilus and the other bishops to come back and to depose Chrysostom again. The prudent patriarch, however, did not wish to run the same risk a second time. He merely wrote to Constantinople that Chrysostom should be condemned for having re-entered his see in opposition to an article of the Synod of Antioch held in the year 341.³⁵ The other bishops

³³ Chrysostom, Sermo post reditum a priore exilio, 1-2. (Migne, op. cit., v. 52, col. 439-440.)

³⁴ Attwater, op. cit., p. 130.

³⁵ Charles Joseph Hefele, A History of the Councils of the Church from the Original Documents. Translated from German by Henry Oxenham. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), v. II, pp. 66, 68: "The contents of the canons promulgated by the Synod in Encaeniis are as follows: . . . 4. If a bishop is deposed by a synod, . . . and he presumes to perform any

had neither the authority nor the courage to give a formal judgment. All they could do was to urge the emperor to sign a new decree of exile, and this he finally did on the twenty-fourth of June, 404.³⁶ The soldiers thereupon conducted Chrysostom a second time into exile, to a lonely mountain village named Cucusus, on the borders of Cilicia and Armenia. Thus the bishop left his cathedral secretly, and his episcopal city, forever; and, in the words of Palladius, "the angel of the church went with him."³⁷

Chrysostom had scarcely left Constantinople, when the cathedral, the senate-house, and other buildings burned down. Naturally the followers of the exiled bishop were blamed and prosecuted. In quick succession Arsacius, then Atticus were appointed bishops of Constantinople. Whoever refused to enter into communion with them, and there were many such, were punished by the confiscation of property and by exile. Meanwhile, Chrysostom never gave up hope of returning to his rightful see. He employed his time in the propagation of the faith in Persia, Phoenicia, and among the Goths, spurring many to undertake these laborious and arduous missions. He was constantly visited by large groups of his faithful flock, who continued to be systematically and cruelly persecuted by his enemies. He maintained a continual correspondence with his friends. The letter to the hermit St. Maro is very affectionate:

function whatsoever in the Church as before, . . . he may no longer hope for reinstatement from another synod, nor for permission to defend himself."

³⁶ So Bauer, op. cit., p. 455.

Cf. Attwater, op. cit., p. 140, where the date is given as June 9.

³⁷ Palladius: Herbert Moore, op. cit., p. 87.

We are bound to one another by ties of love and esteem, and I see you as if you were here; the eyes of love are such that they can penetrate any distance and are not weakened by the passing of the years. I wish I could write to you more often . . . but do you write often and tell me how you are. . . . To know that you are well is a great comfort to me in this wilderness. And above all, do not fail to pray for me.³⁸

When the circumstances of his deposition became known in the West, the Pope and the Italian bishops declared themselves in his favor. Emperor Honorius and Pope Innocent I endeavored to summon a new synod, but their legates were imprisoned and then sent home.³⁹ Further efforts of the Pope on his behalf availed nothing. So the Pope broke off all communion with the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople.⁴⁰

Thus the situation remained for three years. Finally in the summer of 407, Arcadius signed an order to remove Chrysostom to Pithyas, a barbarous place situated on the north east coast of the Euxine sea at the extreme boundary of the empire. The journey, extremely hard on Chrysostom, was made all the harder by the soldiers. He was forced to make long marches, was exposed to the rays of the sun, to the rains, and to the cold of the nights. His body, already weakened by several severe illnesses, finally broke down. On the fourteenth of September the party arrived at

³⁸ Chrysostom, Epistola XXXVI, Μάρωνι πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ μοναζόντι (Migne, op. cit., vol. 52, col. 630.)

³⁹ Palladius: Herbert Moore, op. cit., p. 20.

⁴⁰ Friendly relations were not resumed until, after the death of Chrysostom, they consented to admit his name into the diptychs of the Church.

Comana in Pontus, and stopped at the chapel of St. Basiliscus.⁴¹ In the morning Chrysostom asked to rest there on account of his health. In vain; he was forced to continue his march. But he felt so weak that they had to return to Comana. Some hours later Chrysostom died, on the fourteenth of September 407, the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, in the sixtieth year of his life, and the tenth of his episcopal dignity. His last words were the motto of his life: "Glory be to God for all things."⁴² So died and was buried, St. John Chrysostom, one of that select company whom men begin to understand and honor when he is removed from them. And Husslein adds:

It was a worthy end for the rough and stormy career of a man who now for fifteen hundred years has soothed and charmed, thrilled and inspired mankind. . . . If he died an outcast from the royal city, with his followers persecuted and rooted out, so, too, Christ had died upon the Cross only that death might be swallowed up in victory. "Therefore, Christian," St. John in his turn reminds us, "you are but a poor soldier of Christ if you think you can have the crown without the contest."⁴³

On the twenty-seventh of January, 438, his body was brought to Constantinople.

41 The II Nocturne for the feast of St. John tells us: "Cumque per Armeniam duceretur, sanctus Basiliscus Martyr, in cujus templo antea oraverat, noctu sic eum affatus est: Joannes frater, crastinus dies nos loco conjunget."

42 Palladius, XI: Δόξα τῷ Θεῷ πάντων ἑνεκεν. (Migne, op. cit., vol. 47, col. 38 a.f.)

Cf. also Theodori Trimithuntini, De Vita et exsilio S. Joannis Chrysostomi, 25. (Migne, op. cit., vol. 47, col. LXXIX.)

43 J. Husslein in Preface to St. John Chrysostom, D. Attwater, op. cit., p. x.

"The young Emperor Theodosius II, the son of Arcadius and Eudoxia, bowed low over the remains of the martyr and asked God's forgiveness for the injustice done by his parents to the great saint who had spent himself in the service of the pulpit and archiepiscopal chair of Constantinople.

His remains were afterwards conveyed to Rome, where they lie in the Vatican Basilica, under an altar that bears his name.⁴⁵ His feast is kept on the twenty-seventh of January, the date of his first translation from Pontus to Constantinople. Pope Pius X created St. John Chrysostom the special patron of all sacred orators. It would be proper to let Cardinal Newman, often called the "New Chrysostom," have the final word:

He was, indeed, a man to make both friends and enemies; to inspire affection and to kindle resentment; but his friends loved him with a love "stronger" than "death," and his enemies hated him with a hatred more burning than "hell"; and it was well to be so hated, if he was so beloved.⁴⁶

44 Frank P. Cassidy, Molders of the Medieval Mind, (St. Louis: Herder, 1944), p. 80.

45 So says Father Paul, The Doctors of the Church, (Chicago: Benziger Bros., 1931), p. 29.

Cf. Attwater, op. cit., p. 181, for a different view.

46 John Henry Cardinal Newman, Historical Sketches, (London, 1881-1886) II, 285.

CHAPTER I

THE WRITINGS OF CHRYSOSTOM

The literary legacy of Chrysostom includes extensive exegetical homilies, numerous sermons on miscellaneous subjects, apologetic and ascetico-moral writings, and copious letters. His works fill eighteen volumes of Migne, Patrologia Graeca, XLVII-LXIII. Of no other Greek Father do we possess so many writings. They may be divided into four classes: The treatises, the homilies, the discourses, and the letters.

The chief treatises all date from the earlier days of his literary activity. Of these On the Priesthood is undoubtedly the best. The Exhortation to Theodorus is a fine specimen of pathetic eloquence, and his Comparison between the King and the Monk is very beautiful. Here belongs also Against the Assailants of the Monastic Life. Among the other treatises are his two books on Penance; two apologetic treatises against Julian, and the Jews; a treatise about Widowhood written in Constantinople; a treatise for the benefit of the younger clergy, and another On Virginity. While in his second exile he wrote two treatises, one proving that no one can harm another but only himself, and the other defending the providence of God in spite of what had happened.

The homilies were commentaries on Scripture, both the Old and New Testaments. Chrysostom's method was to explain the literal sense of the passage in a clear and satisfactory manner, and to close his comments with

a moral exhortation, adapted both to the circumstances of the expounded passage, and to the wants of his hearers. Such were the sixty homilies on Genesis,¹ and the fifty-nine homilies on the Psalms.² The best homilies on the New Testament are the ninety on St. Matthew's Gospel.³ But we have also the eighty-eight homilies on the gospel according to St. John; inferior to these are the fifty-five homilies on the Acts of the Apostles. There are one hundred and ten homilies on the letters of St. Paul, the best of these being the thirty-four on the Epistle to the Romans.

The discourses consist of sermons on various texts of the scripture, on different moral subjects, and the festivals of the martyrs. Worthy of special mention are the Homiliae VIII adversus Judaeos, Homiliae XII contra Anomoeos de incomprehensibili Dei Natura, Homilia de resurrectione, Catecheses duae ad illuminandos, Homiliae III de diabolo tentatore, Homiliae IX de poenitentia, Homiliae VII de laudibus s. Pauli, Homiliae XXI de statu ad populum Antiochenum. The letters of Chrysostom number two hundred and thirty-eight⁴ but are not the best models of the epistolary style. Of special value for their contents and intimate nature are the seventeen written to the deaconess Olympias.

Through the years the works of Chrysostom were carefully preserved.

1 Probably preached in Antioch.

2 Only the homilies on sixty psalms have come down to us. It is probable that he preached on the whole book of Psalms, as well as other books of the Old Testament.

3 Preached at Antioch c. 390.

4 All written during his exile.

Translations were made into Latin as early as the time of Pelagius.⁵ But it was only in the seventeenth century that any attempt was made to edit the complete Chrysostom. This work was first undertaken by a Sir Henry Savile, Provost of Eton. Savile with heavy financial backing was able to procure the services of scholars throughout Europe who searched for manuscripts, copied them out wherever they appeared, and sent them to England. The result of this extensive labor was an excellent critical text of Chrysostom, published at Eton, in 1612, in eight volumes of small type.⁶ The text has no accompanying Latin translation. At the same time a Jesuit Father, Fronto Ducaeus,⁷ began a critical edition of the Greek text with a Latin translation in France. He selected the best translations available yet had to do a large share of it himself. He died before he could finish. Frederick Morel began publishing it in Paris in 1609, and Claude Morel finished the publication in six volumes in folio. Ducaeus had finished the commentaries on the Old Testament; Claude Morel then finished the New Testament in six more volumes. A final revised edition appeared in 1636 in twelve volumes. In 1698 the Benedictine Fathers under the leadership of Bernard de Montfaucon with the help of six other Benedictine scholars worked sixteen years and published the best edition in Latin and Greek of

5 Pelagius was a British monk who propagated Pelagianism in Rome and engaged in controversy with St. Augustine. The probable date of his death is 420.

6 Attwater, *op. cit.*, p. 196, states that this edition is said to have cost Savile 8,000 pounds, i.e., \$40,000--though this represents a much larger sum than it does now.

7 Le Duc

the complete works of St. John Chrysostom. This is the edition found in Migne Cursus Patrologiae Completus, Series Graeca, volumes 47 to 63.⁸

In his St. Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres, Louvain, 1907, Dom Bauer gives a list of translations of one or more of the works, or of extracts therefrom, in twenty-two languages, made from the sixteenth century until the end of 1906, disposed as follows: Greek 367, Latin 297, Arabic 3, Armenian 8, Bulgarian 2, Coptic 3, Czech 11, Dutch 5, English 50, French 94, German 46, Italian 46, Magyar 1, Polish 3, Rumanian 1, Russian 3, Serbian 2, Old Slavonic 4, Spanish 4, Swedish 1, Turkish 1, and Ukrainian 1; total 953. Allowing for subsequent publications and for more items in the Slav languages, Syriac and other tongues the total must now be well over one thousand of which fifty editions in five languages are complete.⁹

From the year 386 to the year 404, first the church of Antioch and then the church of Constantinople were more famous for the preaching of St. John Chrysostom than Hippo for that of St. Augustine, or than seventeenth century France was later to become for the sermons of Bossuet or Notre Dame de Paris for the words of Lacordaire. Apart from his dignity and majestic bearing, Chrysostom's personal appearance was far from prepossessing. He seems to have been short and thin; his head was large and bald, his eyes bright and deep-set beneath a very wrinkled forehead, his complexion pale and cheeks hollow, his beard straggly and grey. But of his exalted character it may be said, praestat nihil quam parum dicere; it is better to be silent than to diminish his praises by the slender tribute of panegyric.

8 The Benedictine edition is found in Migne, with the exception of the Homilies on St. Matthew. The best edition of these was done by Field, Homiliae in Matthaëum, Cambridge 1839 in three volumes. It is the Field text that is found in Migne, vols. LVII-LVIII.

9 Attwater, op. cit., p. 197.

Indeed nothing can be added to the account of his life, and the extraordinary encomiums by which the most illustrious men of his age have distinguished his name. He has been styled the brilliant star of the earth; the sun of the universe; the wise interpreter of the secrets of the Almighty. It has been said of him, that he fills the whole world with the light of his doctrine, and instructs by his writings those who can no longer hear his voice."¹⁰

St. Nil wrote to Emperor Arcadius: "Thou hast sent into exile the brightest light of the earth."¹¹ Theodoret calls him "the wisest man in the world."¹² Less profound a theologian than Athanasius, or Augustine, or Gregory of Nazianzen; less independent a thinker than Theodore of Mopsuestia; less learned than Origen or Jerome; less practically successful than Ambrose, yet he combines so many brilliant gifts that he stands almost supreme among the Doctores Ecclesiae as an orator, as an exegete, as a great moral reformer as a saint and confessor.¹³ Campbell adds:

St. John has influenced the world of his own day and of later generations deeply and tangibly. Within his own lifetime, while he was still a young priest, his superior talents were recognized by St. Jerome who gave him deserved notice in his Viri Illustres. The Pelagian heretics, who in their controversy with St. Augustin on original sin first translated him into Latin, unwittingly won for him the approval of the greatest of the Latin Fathers, which gave his works assurance of Western diffusion. John Cassian, whose personal influence and writings contributed to the spread of monasticism in the West, was a favorite disciple of Chrysostom at Constantinople. Cassiodorus, who inaugurated in his monastery the practice of copying manuscripts, included the treatises of Chrysostom among the works to be reproduced. His influence

¹⁰ Wm. Coombes, Sacred Eloquence, (London: J. P. Coghlan, 1798), p. 141.

¹¹ Nil, Epistolae, (Migne, Patrologiae Graecae LXXXIX), col. 521.

¹² Theodoret, Historia Ecclesiastica, v. 34, (Migne, op. cit., LXXXII, col. 1264).

¹³ Philip Schaff, St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1891), p. 53.

on the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century is marked. The great doctors of that glorious period of Scholasticism--St. Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure--appealed to his authoritative witness by quoting passages from him frequently.¹⁴

During the age of the Classic Renaissance twenty-seven of his works were edited by Erasmus. His most read dialogue De Sacerdotio was a stimulating source of reference for Pope Gregory in producing the first treatise on pastoral theology, the Regula Pastoralis.¹⁵ The best French pulpit orators, Bossuet, Massilon, Bourdaloue have taken him for their model, but in his more ornate and declamatory vein; they lack that simple common-sense style of address.¹⁶

Rhetorical studies of the more famous selections of St. John Chrysostom have been made even quite recently: On the Statues¹⁷ by Burns, 1930; Pro Eutropio¹⁸ by Maloney; De Sacerdotio¹⁹ by Maat, 1944. But these are the studies of his occasional oratory. De Sacerdotio is presumably a written treatise. The other two have a dramatic character connected with historical crises.²⁰ On occasions like these any gifted orator may soar

14 James Campbell, The Greek Fathers (New York: Longmans, 1929), p. 73.

15 Campbell, Loc. cit.

16 Schaff, op. cit., p. 52.

17 Sr. M. A. Burns, Saint John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University Press, 1930).

18 Edward R. Maloney, Defence of Eutropius by St. John Chrysostom (New York: Allyn and Bacon, c. 1900).

19 William A. Maat, A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1944).

20 Supra, p. 11 concerning the statues; also p. 15 concerning Eutropius.

to heights of impassioned eloquence. But these orations do not represent the real Chrysostom. They are not his life. They are not his outstanding achievement. Other men have rivalled him in similar fields. No one, however, can contest Chrysostom in the field of the Sunday homily. Here Chrysostom stands alone. Here he towers above the field like a giant among pigmies. Neilson puts it well:

No scornful critic dared to speak lightly of that finished style, the quickening oratory, those enchanting pictures, those momentous truths, those outbursts of emotion, which all went to form a discourse of Chrysostom, and which recalled to scholars the names of only two other men, whose glory as orators was to fill the world and last till the judgment day.²¹

It is this man, or rather his works, that are to be dissected. The writer does this with reluctance and apologies, feeling like a physicist approaching a Botticelli with a protractor, or a botanist approaching an orchid with a probe. It is difficult to be objective and detached about the greatest homilies ever preached. It is difficult enough to read them without being moved; it would have been impossible to hear them, to see Chrysostom actually delivering his sermon, to watch his expressive face with his striking gestures, to listen to the fluent beauty of his words with the endless modulations of his voice, to feel the earnestness and sincerity and animation of that dynamic personality, to witness this and yet retain a scientific, analytical attitude would have been sheerly impossible. Again Neilson:

²¹ D. Neilson, John of the Golden Mouth, quoted in Maloney, Pro Eutropio (Allyn and Bacon, 1900), Intr., p. ix.

He described things as he saw them and felt them; he worked from no copy, he drew from the grand original. Hence the vivid sense of reality we have whilst we read him, and imagine ourselves among the crowds--now asleep for ages--that hung upon his lips. We can almost imagine their eager gleaming eyes, when, as they heard some sentence, a light from heaven broke in upon their minds; and anon they are ready to answer tears with tears, when a stroke of pathos follows and dissolves their hearts. He could touch all chords, and command all the passions at his will. Multitudes bent before him, as reeds and willows bend before the wind. Their minds yielded to a new power, their hearts were stirred, and their imaginations carried captive. They surrendered themselves to a guide who with a hand so strong and a heart so true, could lead them as he chose. . . .²²

The thesis proposes to study the homilies on St. Matthew's Gospel.

This particular group of homiletical works have been chosen, because they are admittedly his best.²³ Particular attention will be focused on the homilies which treat of those sections of St. Matthew that are read in the Mass on certain Sundays and Holydays.²⁴

The thesis will not be concerned with the doctrines of dogmatic, moral, or ascetical theology found in these homilies; its concern is with the method and style of Chrysostom's presentation. It takes for granted that all preachers worthy of the name have something to say; only some say it better. The difference, then, in preachers lies not in what they say, but in how they say it. One man preached so superbly well, as to be surnamed the Golden-mouthed. It is this man's rhetoric the thesis would study, not to vindicate his title, but to discover the secret of his style.

22 D. Neilson, op. cit., p. viii.

23 Bossuet: "His work on St. Matthew is his best." *Avis sur le style et la lecture des Écrivains et des Pères de l'Église pour former un orateur. Oeuvres de Bossuet*, vol. XI, 1863. Quoted in P. Boyle, op. cit., p. xvii.

24 See Appendix. Infra. p. 150.

It is our contention that form is not a sterile concept. The relationship between a preacher's thought and its expression is analagous to the relationship between man's body and his soul. An idea not vitalized by adequate form is still-born. Hence the fallacy of present day over-emphasis upon content to the neglect of form.

It is in the nature of a protest against modern educational trends in general, which have reduced formal schooling to a systematic inculcation of fact, that this thesis is written. More in particular the thesis protests the inadequacy of preparation which the modern student has at the art of self-expression. And specifically the thesis decries the mishandling of the Word of God in our pulpits. Thus, we do not pretend to a purely academic interest, a purely scholarly research, as has been done by Dickinson in The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom.²⁵ Our interest, while literary, is yet personal and practical. We hope that, having listened to one whose speech was as gold, our own efforts on Sunday mornings may ring a little truer.

The thesis then undertakes an analysis of the rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom with special reference to selected homilies on the gospel according to St. Matthew. First, the homily is to be studied as a literary form. Those principles of rhetoric will be selected from classical and modern authors as are applicable to this specialized field of rhetoric. Then, with the laws of homiletics clearly laid down, the homilies are to

²⁵ F. M. Dickinson, The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom, (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1944).

be studied. The object is to see how John of the Golden Mouth has put the theory into practice.

This specific objective of the thesis cannot be made too clear; the thesis is making an analysis, not a critical evaluation. The homilies will be analyzed, not appraised, in the light of the principles garnered from accepted works on rhetoric. While the thesis is concerned with the method employed by Chrysostom to communicate a particular set of ideas and feelings to a specific audience, yet it is not concerned with the effect on or response of said audience. Any attempt to determine the degree of merit which might be assigned to Chrysostom's homiletic performance would take the thesis far afield and invade the domains of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology and related areas. The rhetorical analysis of this thesis is not to be confused with the rhetorical criticism of Thonssen and Baird who define rhetorical criticism as

. . . a comparative study in which standards of judgment deriving from the social interaction of a speech situation are applied to public addresses to determine the immediate or delayed effect of the speeches upon specific audiences, and, ultimately, upon society.²⁶

The object of this thesis is analytical not critical. It proposes to study how Chrysostom achieves his appeal. The object is to see how the master achieves his appeal to the mind, ut veritas pateat; to the heart, ut veritas placeat; to the will, ut veritas moveat. In other words, the homilies must illustrate the laws of clearness, unity, coherence; interest, variety, beauty; emphasis, vigor, and movement.

26 Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Co., c. 1948), p. 9.

Although the thesis is concerned with the style and rhetoric of the homilies, it may not be amiss to consider some general prefatory remarks on the language of Chrysostom, the classical influences in his works, his exegetical methods, the place and date of composition, and the content. These remarks will necessarily be brief.

Chrysostom's Greek differs from the classic Greek of the age of Pericles, as would naturally be expected from the flexible quality of all human speech. Each language, with time, undergoes slow but definite modifications. Besides these natural changes, the spread of the Church itself contributed to both stabilizing and changing the tongue. The letters of the Apostles, as well as the Bible and the Gospels, became a part of the reading in every Church. The methods of expressing Christian dogmas became hallowed and set. But new words were also coined, or old words were made to carry new meanings to express the new Christian teaching. This Church Greek spread farther and farther the more paganism decreased, until it became the common property of all Greek speaking peoples. Chrysostom's language, therefore, is the common language of the fourth and fifth century Greeks--but exceptionally pure. There are some peculiar uses, however. For example the words, φιλοσοφία, οίκονομία, οἱ Ἕλληνες. Thus φιλοσοφία meant originally "love of wisdom," and hence "a systematic pursuit of knowledge." Today it is accepted generally to mean "knowledge of ultimate principles." But in Chrysostom, while it could mean "philosophy," it is better understood to refer to the truth Christ came to impart, or perhaps "virtue." Thus we come across expressions such as: ἡ ἀρετή . . .

τῶν μάνων ἰδῆς τὴν φιλοσοφίαν,²⁷ "to set before your eyes those Wise-
 men's love of wisdom";²⁸ and: "How much more we who have been nurtured in
 so many lessons of virtue?"²⁹-- πόσω μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τοσούτοις
 τραφεύτες λόγοις φιλοσοφίας;³⁰ The word οἰκονομία meant the manage-
 ment of a household or family in Plato, then public economy or administration
 of states; but in Chrysostom it means a part or the total of the means of
 salvation ordained by God for mankind. For example, he says: "The greatness
 of the Economy would not have been believed,"³¹-- οὐκ ἂν ἐπιστευθῇ τῆς
οἰκονομίας τὸ μέγεθος.³² Οἱ "Ἕλληνες does not refer to Greeks as we
 would expect but only to those who were still pagans, while all converted
 peoples regardless of race were called οἱ Χριστιανοί. Thus he says:
 Ποιήσωμεν τὴν γῆν οὐρανόν· ἐντεῦθεν δεῖξωμεν "Ἕλλησιν", ὅσων
 εἰσὶν ἀπεστερημένοι καλῶν.³³ "Let us make earth, heaven; let us show
 the Greeks of how great blessings they are deprived."³⁴ And again: Διὰ
 τοῦτο καὶ "Ἕλληνες ἀπιστοῦσι τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν λεγομένοις.³⁵ "For
 this cause the very Heathens disbelieve the things that we say."³⁶

27 Homily 8, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 83. Italics not in text.

28 Homily 8 in The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St. Matthew. Translated by George Prevost. (Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1876), Vol. 1, p. 108. Italics not in text.

29 Homily 36, Prevost, op. cit., v. 2, p. 529

30 Homily 36, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 417

31 Homily 8, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 108

32 Homily 8, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 83

33 Homily 43, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 463

34 Homily 43, Prevost, op. cit., v. 2, p. 606

35 Homily 12, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 208

36 Homily 12, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 171

Chrysostom's classical education often betrays itself in references and allusions to the mythology of Greek antiquity. For example, he writes:

For to me poverty seems like some comely, fair and well-shaped damsel, but covetousness like some monster-shaped woman, some Scylla or Hydra, or some other like prodigy feigned by fabulous writers.³⁷

His familiarity with classical Greek authors is apparent in direct references. He speaks of "the smoothness of Isocrates, the strength of Demosthenes, the gravity of Thucydides, the sublimity of Plato."³⁸ He describes Anacharsis, Crates, and Diogenes as caring little for eloquence, and quotes the beginning of the Apologia to show that if Socrates did not put high value on mere fine talking, how much less should a Christian.³⁹ When he compares the crowd of the congregation before him to the sea and the play upon the surface of that sea of heads to the effect of a strong west wind

37 Homily 90 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1173.

38 Chrysostom, On the Priesthood, Translated by Patrick Boyle, op. cit., p. 99.

39 Chrysostom, Adversus oppugnatores Vitae Monasticae, Bk. III, 11, in Migne, op. cit., v. 47, cols. 367-368:

Εἰσαγαγὼν γὰρ αὐτόν ποτε εἰς δικαστήριον ἀπολογησόμενον, ἐν τῇ πρὸς τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀπολογία ἐποίησεν οὕτω λέγοντα· Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐμοῦ ἀκούεσθε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, οὐ μέντοι μὰ Δί', ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κεκαλλιεπημένους γε λόγους, ὥσπερ οἱ τούτων, ῥήμασί τε καὶ ὀνόμασιν, οὐδὲ κεκοσμένους, ἀλλ' ἀκούεσθε ἀπλῶς καὶ εἰκῇ λεγόμενα τοῖς ἐπιτυχοῦσιν ὀνόμασι. Πιστεύω γὰρ δίκαια εἶναι ἃ λέξω, καὶ μηδεὶς ὑμῶν προσδοκησάτω ἄλλως. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν δῆπου πρόποι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τῇδε, ὥσπερ μεираκιῷ πλάττουσι λόγους, εἰς ὑμᾶς εἰσεῖναι.

stirring and bending the ears of corn,⁴⁰ it is impossible not to be reminded of the well-known simile in Homer.⁴¹

It is often said that in later life he was hostile to the classical learning of which he had imbibed so much. Several times he censures The Republic:

Not like Plato, who composed that ridiculous Republic, or Zeno, or if there be any one else who has written a polity, or has framed laws. For, indeed, in regard to all these, it has been made manifest by themselves, that an evil spirit, and some cruel demon at war with our race, and foe to modesty, and an enemy to good order, oversetting all things, has made his voice heard in their soul. When, for example, they make their women common to all, and stripping virgins naked in the palaestra, bring them into the gaze of men; and when they establish secret marriages, mingling all things together and confounding them, and overturning all the limits of nature, what else is there to say? Only that these their sayings are all inventions of devils!⁴²

Speaking of the spread of Christianity he says:

Where now is Plato? Where Pythagoras? Where is the long chain of Stoics? For the first, after having enjoyed great honor, was so practically refuted, as even to be sold out of the country, and to succeed in none of his objects, no, not even as to one tyrant; yea, he betrayed his disciples, and ended his life miserably. And the Cynics, mere

⁴⁰ Chrysostom, De Poenitentia, VI, 1, Migne, op. cit., v. 49, col. 313.

Ὡς τερπνὰ τῆς πνευματικῆς ταύτης ἡμῖν θαλάσσης τὰ κύματα, καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ πελάγει τερπνότερα . . . οὕτω καὶ ξεφύρου πνοαὶ ὅταν ἐμπέσωσιν εἰς ληϊά, καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν ἀσταχύων ἐπικλίνωσι καὶ διανιστῶσι, τὰ κύματα τῆς θαλάσσης ἐπὶ τῆς χέρσου μιμῶνται.

⁴¹ IΛΙΑΔΟΣ B144-149, from Homeri Opera, edidit Guilelmus Baeumlein, (Lipsiae: Ex Officina Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1854), Pars I, Ilias, p. 30:

κινήθη δ' ἄγορῇ ὡς κύματα μακρὰ θαλάττης,
πόντου Ἰκαρίοιο, τὰ μὲν τ' Εὐρώς τε Νότος τε
ῥορ' ἐπαΐξας πατὴρ Διὸς ἐκ νεφελῶν.
ὡς δ' ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λῆϊον ἐλθὼν,
λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπὶ τ' ἡμῶν ἀσταχέουσιν,
ὥς τῶν πᾶσ' ἄγορῃ κινήθη.

⁴² Homily 1, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 9

pollutions as they were, have all passed by like a dream and a shadow. And yet surely no such thing ever befell them, but rather they were accounted glorious for their heathen philosophy, and the Athenians made a public monument of the epistles of Plato, sent them by Dion; and they passed all their time at ease, and abounded in wealth not a little. Thus, for instance, Aristippus was used to purchase costly harlots; and another made a will, leaving no common inheritance; and another, when his disciples had laid themselves down like a bridge, walked on them; and he of Sinope, they say, even behaved himself unseemly in the market place. . . . But there are some also, one may say, skilled in war among them; as Themistocles, Pericles. But these things too are children's toys, compared with the acts of the fishermen. For what can you say? That he persuaded the Athenians to embark in their ships, when Xerxes was marching upon Greece? Why in this case, it was not Xerxes, but the devil with the whole world, and innumerable evil spirits assailing these twelve men, not at one crisis only, but throughout their whole life. And what was truly marvelous, not by slaying their adversaries, did they prevail and vanquish, but by converting and reforming them.⁴³

But if he esteems St. Paul and the Apostles above Plato and Aristotle, that is nothing remarkable in a Christian. He exalts "the power of 'philosophy' brought by Christ to man;"⁴⁴ it was his life's work to do so. His main objections lay not so much against classical Greek learning as against the fact that it was imparted by pagan teachers who defended the myths of the ancient gods. In spite of all this, his dialectical method insistently reminds us of Plato; his well-turned periods echo the periods of the great classic orators.

The homilies on St. Matthew were undoubtedly delivered at Antioch, for he says

And you, when there is a question of precedence, claim to take first place in the whole world, forasmuch as our city first crowned itself

⁴³ Homily 33 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 2, p. 486.

⁴⁴ Attwater, op. cit., p. 11.

with the name of Christian;⁴⁵ but in competition of chastity, you are not ashamed to be behind the rudest cities.⁴⁶

As to the date of composition, they were probably composed during the time when he preached as a priest. Montfaucon considers his little mention of the sin of swearing as a sign of his having accomplished some reformation on that point by his previous preaching. In the homilies delivered from 386 to 388, swearing is a constant topic; and the homilies known to belong to that period are so numerous, as scarcely to leave room for such a series as these on St. Matthew.⁴⁷ The argument from his reference to dissensions some time gone by, possibly those between St. Meletius and Paulinus and Evagrius is not very conclusive.

In his exegetical methods Chrysostom shows the effects of his training in the Antiochian school. Unlike the practice in the school of Alexandria of discovering allegorical interpretations, the school at Antioch labored to discover the grammatical sense of a passage of Scripture, before undertaking to expound it. Chrysostom disclaimed allegory except where it was evident that the Sacred Writings revealed allegorical intention. Thus in commenting on the text: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth," he says:

45 Supra, p. 5 : reference to Acts 11, 26.

46 Homily 7 in Prevost, op. cit., vol 1, p. 105.

47 Thus C. Marriot in preface to Oxford Edition of the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom. Translated by George Prevost. Revised by M. B. Riddle. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903).

Tell me, what kind of earth? Some⁴⁸ say a figurative⁴⁹ earth, but it is not this, for nowhere in Scripture do we find any mention of an earth that is merely figurative. But what can the saying mean? He holds out a sensible prize. . . . Thus He does not incite us by means of the future blessings only, but of the present also, for the sake of the grosser sort of His hearers.⁵⁰

In the ninety homilies he explains the entire gospel according to St. Matthew, but he is at great pains to collate and harmonize the apparent discrepancies with the other three Evangelists. Thus in describing the incident in Matthew 8, 23 about the storm at sea⁵¹ he says:

Now Luke, to free himself from having the order of time required of him, said thus: "And it came to pass on a certain day that He went into a ship with his disciples;" and Mark in like manner. But this Evangelist not so, but he maintains the order in this place too. For they did not all write all things in this way. And these things I have mentioned lest anyone from the omission should suppose there was a discordance.⁵²

And again, describing the miracle of the demoniacs, he says:

. . . but the other Evangelists,⁵³ have added, that they also entreated and adjured Him not to cast them into the deep. . . . And though Luke and those who follow him say that it was one person, but this Evangelist two, this does not exhibit any discrepancy at all. I grant if they had said, there was only one, and no other, they would appear to disagree with Matthew; but if the former spoke of the one, the latter of the two, the statement comes not of disagreement, but of a different manner of narration.⁵⁴

48 Thus St. Augustine in De Sermone Domini in Monte, lib. 1, c. 4.

49 νοητὴν

50 Homily 15, in Prevost, op. cit., p. 202.

51 Cf. Luke 8, 22; Mark 4, 35.

52 Homily 28 in Prevost, op. cit., p. 414.

53 Cf. Luke 8, 31; Mark 5, 10.

54 Homily 28 in Prevost, op. cit., p. 418.

But the homilies are not pure cut and dried exegesis; they include all of Christian morality, all the commandments, all the virtues. He takes up all the sins and vices, shows their ugliness and malice, and presents the sinner with the means to quit his sinful life and regain the path of virtue. For the good, saintly people there are always the exhortations to a more perfect life and warnings about temptation and occasion of sin. The theatre is the theme of his frequent reprobation, and the monks in the mountains near Antioch the subject of his praise. In the Homilies 69 and 70 he describes their mode of life as an edifying example to all. In relation to their heathen neighbors, Chrysostom urges his Christians to convert them by good example.

Do you know why the pagans⁵⁵ refuse to believe us? Because they expect us to prove the truth of our teaching by deed and not by words; and when they see us building fine houses and buying baths and gardens and lands, they do not believe that we really regard our time on earth as simply a preparation for eternal life. . . . Thus do we betray the mission that Christ had entrusted to us. We are no longer the salt of the earth, and we shall be punished for having lost our savour.⁵⁶

He is tireless in working for the purity of religious faith and practice.

If you were given a choice between raising the dead in Christ's name and dying for His name, would you not choose martyrdom? For martyrdom is a deed, but a miracle is only a sign. Were you given a choice between turning straw into gold and trampling riches underfoot like straw, would you not choose the second? For if you were seen turning straw into gold, everybody would want to do the same thing, like Simon Magus, and the love of money would simply get worse; but did everyone look on gold as so much straw, evil would have disappeared from the world long ago. Is it signs or good deeds that really constitute our life? Good deeds, of course!⁵⁷

55 οἱ Ἕλληνες

56 Homily 12, Migne, op. cit., vol. 57, col. 208; translated by Attwater, op. cit., p. 49.

57 Homily 24. Translated in Attwater, op. cit., p. 52.

Though he is particularly insistent on practising humility and avoiding vanity, the most remarkable exhortations are on the subject of almsgiving. His calculation about ten rich men distributing their wealth and doing away with poverty in Antioch is curious.⁵⁸ But so important is the practice of this virtue that he speaks of avarice and almsgiving, poverty and riches at some length in twenty-six homilies.⁵⁹ He defended this constant preaching on almsgiving by saying:

But perhaps some one will say, "You are every day discoursing to us of almsgiving and humanity." Neither will I cease to speak of it. For if you had attained to it, in the first place, not even then ought I to desist, for fear of making you more remiss; yet had you attained, I might have relaxed a little; but if you have not arrived at the half, say not these things to me; as if a little boy, hearing often of the letter Alpha, and not learning it, were to blame the teacher, because he is continually and forever reminding him about it.⁶⁰

How much success attended these exhortations on giving up wealth? Chrysostom's people were like the rich young man in the Gospel, who heard the words and went away saddened. Chrysostom continues:

For who from these discourses has become more forward in the giving of alms? Who has cast down his money? Who has given the half of his substance? Who the third part? No one!⁶¹

Much the same could be said about all his preaching. For the practical results of any man's preaching are a matter upon which little can

58 Homily 66, Migne, op. cit., v. 58, col. 630.

59 Homilies 5, 13, 20, 21, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 58, 62, 63, 64, 66, 71, 73, 77, 80, 81, 83, 85, 88, 90.

60 Homily 88, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1053.

61 Loc. cit.

usually be said with certainty. External effects are very apt to be misleading, and inward effects in their fulness are known only to God. Over and above the diffidence of any holy man about his own achievements, Chrysostom was deeply dissatisfied with the results of his unwearying labors. He would say:

Since as things are, to say the truth, we have fairly given up in despair. . . . I see no advantage at all gained, but you are still clinging to the former rude beginnings, which is enough to fill the teacher with weariness.⁶²

And: "My work is like that of a man who is trying to clean a piece of ground into which a muddy stream is constantly flowing."⁶³ That is the final verdict on himself of perhaps the greatest preacher who ever lived.

62 Homily 17, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 268.

63 Attwater, op. cit., p. 73.

CHAPTER II

THE HOMILY

The object of all oratory is obviously persuasion, i.e., influencing the mind of the hearer. Therefore the various species of oratory are distinguished with reference to the mind of the hearer. Aristotle says:

Now the hearer must necessarily be either a mere spectator or a judge, and a judge either of things past or of things to come. For instance, a member of the general assembly is a judge of things to come; the dicast, of things past; the mere spectator, of the ability of the speaker. Therefore, there are necessarily three kinds of rhetorical speeches, deliberative, forensic, and epideictic.¹

He further explains that deliberation deals with exhortation and dissuasion; it regards a future measure, viewed usually as expedient or inexpedient. Forensic rhetoric, on the other hand, is concerned with accusation and defence; it regards a past fact as just or unjust. Epideictic or demonstrative oratory is employed in praising or blaming persons for what is honorable or disgraceful; it usually regards the present, for qualities presently possessed are wont to make a man admirable or contemptible.²

Thus the ancients viewed the mind of the hearer as variously conditioned and laid down their logical divisions of oratory. But in these three varieties they considered the hearer as deciding or speculating on

1 ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ ΤΕΧΝΗ ΠΡΟΤΡΙΚΗ, Bk. I, ii, 1-3. Translated in Aristotle, *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, Translated by John H. Freeze (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926), pp. 32-33.

2 Aristotle, *op. cit.*, in Freeze, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

natural principles alone: natural justice, natural usefulness, natural honor. There is, however, still a fourth species of oratory to suit the peculiar state of mind of a hearer who views things in a supernatural light. This is sacred oratory, for which the ancients had no equivalent. "It is doubtful if any religion, until Christianity's advent, provided for the regular and frequent assemblage of masses of men to hear religious instruction and exhortation."³ It is the highest and most important species of eloquence since it promotes the reign of peace, justice, and true wisdom upon earth; it is the highest and most important species of eloquence since it affects chiefly and primarily the eternal happiness of every individual man; it is the highest and most important species of eloquence since it echoes the words of the Logos who came down from heaven and used human speech to tell God's word to men; it is the highest and most important species of eloquence since the Bible tells us: "And they that instruct many to justice [shall shine] as stars for all eternity."⁴ Sacred oratory is not a thing purely human; it requires, on the one hand, God's special providence, special graces, and special mission--all conferred through the Sacrament of Holy Orders; and, on the other hand, on the part of man it requires a lively faith, viewing all things in a supernatural light, the spirit of prayer, deep humility, confidence in God, and an ardent zeal. And in so far as it is this, it is beyond analysis.

³ John Sharp, Next Sunday's Sermon (Philadelphia: Dolphin, 1940), p. 3.

⁴ Daniel 12, 3: The Holy Bible, Translated from the Latin Vulgate. (New York: C. Wildermann Co., Inc. Imprimatur 1911), p. 946.

Yet sacred eloquence is a human thing too, a product of a human mind and heart. But even here unanalyzable factors present themselves. Because it is a reflection of the preacher's whole personality--his heredity, environment, training, discipline, study, observation, experience, graces received, spiritual trials, defects and victories--in so far as it is this, it again eludes analysis. Hence prescinding from grace and the psychic forces that act and react in the soul of the preacher, the sacred discourse is considered simply as a piece of writing put down with intent to be preached, with certain definite qualities of style quite within the scope of study and analysis.

Not only does sacred oratory differ from profane in subject matter and supernatural influences, but also in the attitude of the speaker and hearers. The preacher is more than a lawyer pleading at the bar, more than the professor lecturing his class, more than the legislator speaking in favor of a law, more than the speaker honoring some guest at a banquet. His audience are at once the jury and the defendants passing verdicts on themselves; his audience are pupils not learning facts but a way of life; his audience are not guests of honor though at a Banquet. While he exhorts them they are willing to accept God's law and truth with love, and hope, and faith. They are docile and obedient. The pulpit announces and demonstrates the truths of Christianity, and the preacher speaks with Christ's own authority.

Sacred having been distinguished from profane oratory, the next step is to determine where the homily fits into the scheme of sacred oratory.

There are in general three classes of sacred discourses: didactic, exhortatory, and festive. Didactic speeches are either familiar discourses, as, for example, the teachings of Our Lord, the Apostles, the catechetical work of missionaries; or dogmatic lectures which are more dignified, elaborate, and philosophical. Festive orations may be of three classes: (a) discourses on the mysteries celebrated by the Church on her solemn festivals, as Christmas or Easter; (b) panegyrics on the saints, as St. Chrysostom's Oration on St. Ignatius; (c) speeches on special occasions, as funeral orations. Exhortatory discourses aim directly at moving the will of the hearers through conviction and persuasion.

The exhortatory discourses may assume the form of the set moral sermon or of the homily. The set moral sermon must always deal with but one subject, though it be a combination of dogma with exhortation. Mission sermons belong to this type. The term, homily, is derived from the Greek ὁμιλία or familiar discourse, and was used by the Fathers to designate their familiar instructions. As these talks were usually commentaries on the Holy Scripture, the word homily came to be used to denote explanations of the Holy Writ; and this is its ordinary meaning today.

At present there are four recognized ways of treating the homily, but not all to be equally commended. The first method consists in treating separately each sentence of the Gospel. This was the uniform method of St. Anselm, as we gather from the sixteen sermons that have come down to us. It is not recommended, for it gives, at best, but a fragmentary and scattered treatment. It lays down no one proposition; it aims at no unity

of purpose. The second method is quite the opposite; it focuses the entire content of the Gospel in a single idea. Is usually called the higher homily, and differs from the formal or set moral sermon only in the absence of introduction and peroration. It is clear that only certain Gospels, for example, the parables, can be treated in this way. The third kind selects some virtue or vice arising out of the Gospel, and treats one or the other to the exclusion of all else. This kind of homily is commonly called a prone. The fourth kind is that which first paraphrases and explains the entire Gospel, and then makes an application of it. This, the method of St. John Chrysostom, seems, except where the higher homily applies, to be the best, because it can guard against the besetting defect of the homily, namely, a tendency to lack unity and continuity. The advantages of the homily are that it is a form of preaching which was in use from the very beginning of Christianity; it is simple and easily understood; it affords a better opportunity than the formal sermon for interweaving Sacred Scripture.

Every successful speech, sacred or profane, is built up of the following parts: (1) An Introduction or Exordium--the speaker introduces himself or his subject to the audience; (2) Narration or Explanation--he narrates certain facts which the audience must know or explains his position; (3) The Proposition--declared or implied; (4) The Argumentation or Proofs--these may be preceded by an outline with the arguments clearly divided from each other, and may be followed by a recapitulation; (5) The Pathetic--stirring the passions; (6) The Refutation--answering any remaining objections or difficulties before concluding; (7) The Conclusion or Peroration. It is

important to note that all these parts may occur,⁶ but they need not all occur. Nor need they occur in the order given. Thus, for example, a part, or even the whole of the refutation may be placed right after the introduction when it is important to clear away prejudices or misconceptions. The pathetic may occur almost anywhere, and even several times in the same speech. Chrysostom followed this plan in his occasional oratory, as for example, in the successful speech of Flavian to Theodosius. The people of Antioch had insulted the emperor during a tumult;⁷ a severe punishment was ordered by the latter. The aged Bishop Flavian, in a speech by St. John Chrysostom, pleads for pardon and obtains it.

The Introduction--allays the emperor's anger:

- a) By exhibiting humility and love;
- b) By artfully presenting another object for indignation;
- c) By exciting pity for the condemned city.

The Proposition (implied)--You should pardon.

Arguments:

A. Extrinsic:

- 1. Example of God pardoning man. This is skillfully treated, showing that in the present case, as in the example cited, the evil spirit is chiefly to blame, and is punished by the act of pardon.
- 2. Example of Constantine; its glory amplified.
- 3. Example of Theodosius himself, applying a wish which he once uttered, that he might do something great for Antioch, to the present case.

B. Intrinsic:

- 1. Glory of pardoning shown from its nature and effects; it will add lustre to the emperor's fame and religion.

⁶ All these parts actually do occur in Cicero's Oration on the Manilian Law, which is probably the most regular great speech in existence.

⁷ This is the incident about the Statues. Cf. Supra, p. 11.

2. Its rewards from God.
3. The propriety of granting this to a bishop:
 - a) It shows more freedom;
 - b) It argues piety;
 - c) The bishop is a messenger from God, the Judge;
 - d) He comes without gifts, inviting the emperor to imitate God.

The Peroration: If you do not pardon, I cannot and will not return to my people.

Attention is called to the use of the exordium in this speech which on this occasion was very necessary, because the emperor was in no mood to hear the bishop's plea. The function of the exordium according to Quintilian is to render the "audito rem benevolum, attentum, docilem";⁸ and according to Cicero, "ut amice, ut intellegenter, ut attente audiamur."⁹ Hence Chrysostom had to conciliate the good-will of the emperor and to render him well-disposed to the speaker and to the subject, removing the prejudice against his cause. The exordium here is of the calm type, the kind Demosthenes usually used. An example of the calm but solemn is found in Demosthenes' Oration on the Crown.¹⁰ It may also be passionate, such as Cicero

⁸ Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, Bk. IV, 1, 5. The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian. Translated by H. E. Butler (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921), vol. II, p. 9: "The audience well-disposed, attentive and ready to receive instruction."

⁹ Cicero, De Partitione Oratoria, VIII, 28. Translated by H. Rackam, in v. 2 of De Oratore (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), p. 333: "to secure for us a friendly hearing, an intelligent hearing, and an attentive hearing."

¹⁰ ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΥ, 1-8. Demosthenes On the Crown. Edited by William W. Goodwin (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1910), pp. 1-6.

uses in his First Catilinian Oration; ¹¹ and Chrysostom uses this ex abrupto introduction in his Pro Eutropio, ¹² where the audience is already excited by unusual circumstances. Eutropius, as prime minister, had oppressed the faithful of Constantinople; disgraced he had sought refuge in the cathedral; the indignant populace clamored for his death. St. John ascended the pulpit to calm them, and reduced them all to tears; they forgave and interceded for the fallen minister with the Emperor Arcadius. Chrysostom began his sermon by insisting on a truth which everyone grants: the vanity of honors and riches, thus inspiring pity for a man who had been beguiled by these, and who was already so much punished. The plan is as follows:

Introduction (ex abrupto): Greatness is vanished; the foe is prostrate.

Proposition I: The vanity of life should be ever remembered.
The idea is developed by enumeration, description, contrast. Hence the fall of one should be a lesson for all.

Proposition II: Elevation is not only vain, but dangerous.

Proof: See how the minister is fallen. A tableau to move pity.

Refutation: Obj. 1 - He has insulted the Church.

Ans. - Therefore God has wished him to feel her power and her mercy.

Obj. 2 - No glory in pardoning such a wretch.

Ans. - a) Such was the harlot pardoned by our Saviour.

b) Thus Christ forgave His enemies on the cross.

Peroration: contains the main proposition: Let us pray for him and intercede for him with the emperor.

¹¹ Cicero, Oratio in Catilinam Prima in Senatu habita, I, 1-3. Selections from Cicero by Charles E. Bennett (Chicago: Allyn and Bacon, c. 1922), pp. 1-2.

¹² IOANNOY TOY XPYZOCTOMOY OMIAIA EIZ EYTPONION, I. Edited by Edward R. Maloney (Chicago: Allyn and Bacon, c. 1900), pp. 1-2.

But the homily differs in plan from the formal oration. In the first place it dispenses with the exordium. Thus in homily 13 the text to be discussed is: "Then was Jesus led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil."¹³ Chrysostom's very first words are: "Then. When? After the descent of the Spirit, after the Voice that was borne from above, and said. . . ."¹⁴ The homily also dispenses with the Narration for the audience has but to hear the text in order to know what will be explained. Neither is there need for division, for the explanation will take up the verse part by part. The argumentation forms one-half the body of the homily. This is the exposition, paraphrasing and explaining the text. The second half, because it is a half, can hardly be called a peroration. It consists in making the application of what has been explained to the lives of the hearers. A more detailed plan of the homily will appear in the next chapter.

It has already been pointed out that the homily differs from profane oratory in as much as anything supernatural differs from the natural. But because all the supernatural is built on the natural, it is possible to consider the natural appeal of the homily to the natural man. It is only under this aspect that it admits of study. The basic appeal of all oratory must be directed to the whole man, to his mind, to his heart, to his will. Cicero put it that the oration must be such ut doceat, ut delectet, ut

¹³ Matt. 4, 1

¹⁴ Homily 13, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 206.

flectat.¹⁵ St. Augustine adapted this triple purpose, and gave what is now accepted as the aim of all Christian preaching: ut veritas pateat, ut placeat, ut moveat.¹⁶

Perhaps some confusion may arise as to whether it is the homily that should, for example, please, or the truth presented in the homily. But there is only a very subtle distinction between the two. They are both aspects of the same thing. Looked at actively, as presenting the truth, it is the homily; looked at passively, as what is being presented, it is the truth. Hence the same qualities with which Augustine would vest the truth, must also invest the homily. It is the truth that must be known, be loved, be acted upon. It is the truth that must be clear, pleasing, and forceful. It is the truth that must make its appeal to the mind as knowing, the heart as loving, the will as acting. But the truth does this only through the homily. Hence, to present the truth clearly, to appeal effectively to the heart, the homily must be pleasing; to present the truth forcefully, to move the will to action, the homily must be persuasive.

This triple objective of the homily, then--to instruct, to please, to move--serves as the basis of our division for the following chapters. Thus Chapter IV--Ut Pateat--takes up the qualities of Unity, Coherence, and Clearness. Chapter V--Ut Placeat--is concerned with Variety, Interest, and

¹⁵ Cicero, Brutus, LXXX: ". . .tria videri esse quae orator efficere debecet, ut doceret ut delectaret ut moverat. . . ." Translated by G. I. Hendrickson (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942), p. 239: ". . . these are three things the orator must effect, to teach, to please and to move. . . ."

¹⁶ P. A. Beecher, "Homiletics," Catholic Encyclopedia, (New York: Robert Appleton Co., 1910), VII, 446A.

Beauty. Chapter VI--Ut Moveat--studies Emphasis, Vigor, and Movement. Easy and natural as this division may seem at first, yet it is not so. Considerable overlapping is inevitable, since the function of these nine qualities is not exclusive. Clearness of truth is beautiful, variety and beauty move us. And the difficulty increases the more detailed the breakdown of the mechanics of rhetoric. This is particularly true where a figure of speech may serve several purposes; thus under what specific quality of style is the simile to be classified? It serves to clarify, it produces variety, it contributes to interest, it adds emphasis. In cases like this, the figure was definitely allocated in one group, with incidental mention being made of it under another heading. It is hoped that the grouping of the material in this thesis will not seem too arbitrary.

No apology need be made for the profusion of quotations in the thesis. It is impossible to arrive at any appreciation of a writer with whose material a reader is scarcely familiar. Quotations are referred to the text in Migne, Cursus Patrologiae Completus, Series Graeca, Volumes 58 and 59. Each homily is divided into several sections. But these are practically useless in locating a given word or text. Therefore references are usually made to Migne by column number (from 1 to 1064) and the use of init., am., cm., p.m., pr.f. As this seemed unsatisfactory, references will be made, where necessary, by column number followed immediately by line number in that column though the numbering of lines does not appear in the margin of the text. References to Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, without accompanying reference to a translation indicate that the writer of this thesis is re-

sponsible for their translation into English. Quotation from Chrysostom's homilies not referred to Migne are based on George Prevost's translation in The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St. Matthew. Credit for this translation is given in footnotes. However, after comparison with the original text, it seemed unsatisfactory in many places and had to be revised and modernized by the writer.

CHAPTER III

UT PATEAT

Whatever be the psychology behind it, one fact is incontestable: the human mind can assimilate a series of truths or ideas only in direct proportion to their unity, clearness, and coherence. These three qualities are so closely related to each other that whatever affects one, affects the others. Unity will be treated first.

Unity.

Cardinal Newman in his Letter to Maynooth Students¹ says:

"As to the writing or delivery of sermons . . . the great thing seems to be to have your subject distinctly before you--to take care that it should be one subject, not several--to sacrifice every thought however good and clever, which does not tend to bring out your one point, and to aim earnestly and supremely to bring home that one point to the minds of your hearers."

Lack of unity of purpose in a composition at once destroys its effectiveness. It divides the attention of the reader and at best brings about a confusion of ideas. It is even more fundamental in a speech. Yet it is hardest come by in a homily. The preacher finds himself in a dilemma. On the one hand, he must not take too long a pericope to explain, and on the other hand, his text must not be too short. If the section he takes for his exegesis is too large, he will have to skim over the surface; he will explain the meaning superficially, making too many undeveloped, weak appli-

¹ Quoted in John Sharp, Next Sunday's Sermon (Philadelphia: Dolphin, 1940), p. 77.

cations, piling up thought on thought with a complete loss of unity, emphasis and effectiveness. But if the section be too small, the preacher will delay endlessly on each phrase of the text, paraphrasing it, ferreting out hidden meanings, developing the literal, the typical, and the accommodated sense of the passage, making a minute study of each word, till again the unity of even the single incident is lost. Furthermore with such a procedure, he would take years to finish a single Evangelist. Chrysostom solves the difficulty by applying the rule of the golden mean. Thus in the text concerning the Three Magi, he breaks up the incident into three parts: (a) The star and the call of the Wisemen, Matt. 2, 1-3--Homily 6; (b) Their pause in Jerusalem with Herod, Matt. 2, 4-10--Homily 7; (c) Their arrival at the crib and subsequent events, Matt. 2, 11-13 sqq.--Homily 8.²

Yet there is a certain natural unity with which the homily is endowed by the text under discussion, provided the latter constitute a logical whole, or at least be not too extensive. The preacher has but to announce the section to be explained and, if he explains the text and makes a suitable application, his homily perforce has a degree of unity. Thus Chrysostom's 10th homily on Matt. 3, 1-6 takes up the incident of St. John the Baptist, beginning with "In those days cometh John. . . ." The homily opens with the words: "How 'in those days'?" It goes on to explain that according to the use in Sacred Scripture, it really means when Christ was thirty years old. Then the homily explains the purpose of John's baptising, namely, to awaken the sense of sin and the longing for a Redeemer, thus preparing for the arrival of Christ. Further, it explains John's preaching "Do penance," and

² See Appendix. *Infra*, p. 150

how it resembled Isaias. Then it develops verse 4--the physical appearance of the Baptist, his camel's hair garment and leathern girdle, and their significant contempt for the softness of the world. Next it makes a brief comment on verse 5, the effect of John's preaching. Then the application:

This man . . . let us also emulate and forsaking luxury and drunkenness let us go over unto the life of restraint . . . not only to forsake our former evil deeds, but also to show forth good deeds greater than the evil ones. . . .³

Chrysostom then elaborates what good deeds will offset what sins we have committed. Thus, with skillful handling, a homily can have unity.

But as was pointed out, the audience must know the text to be explained, and Chrysostom often urges his people to pre-read the text before his sermon. He says in Homily 1:

Wherefore I entreat you to follow us with much diligence, so as to enter into the very ocean of the things written, with Christ for our guide at this our entering in. But in order that the word may be the more easy to learn, we pray and entreat you, to take up beforehand that portion of the Scripture, which we will explain, that your reading may prepare for your understanding . . . and so may greatly facilitate our task.⁴

In his homilies Chrysostom adapts himself mainly to the needs of the majority, without neglecting to suggest some wholesome thoughts for the consideration of the others. Thus he would say: "But let me speak also to you, who publicly disgrace yourselves."⁵ At times he goes so far as deliberately to destroy the unity of his sermon by making too many applications. He himself says: "I treat of so many things in each of my sermons and make

3 Homily 10 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 141.

4 Homily 1 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 12.

5 Homily 15 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 221.

them so varied because I want everybody to find something special for himself in it and not go home empty-handed."⁶ At other times he had a definite objective to achieve, as when he felt the need of continually reminding his people to stay away from the theatre. Whatever the text, whatever the applications he made, he managed to get in a few words on the theatre. This he justified in Homily 7:

Now then for a while, in order not to be too burdensome, I will bring my discourses to an end here. But if you continue in the same courses, I will make the knife sharper, and the cut deeper; and I will not cease, till I have scattered the theatre of the devil, and so purified the assembly of the Church.⁷

Chrysostom tried to obtain a higher unity than the unity of the single homily. He felt that in his breaking up of a text they would lose the trend of the whole gospel. The obvious way to overcome this difficulty would be to connect each succeeding homily with a few words of summary on the one preceding. But he rarely ever does so. Only in a few homilies does he make mention of what he had said before. Thus having discoursed in Homily 21 on the text: "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat. Behold the birds of the air. . . .,"⁸ in his next homily, the twenty-second, he will speak on the text: "And for raiment why are ye solicitous?"⁹ He begins this twenty-second homily: "Having spoken of our necessary food, and having signified that not even for this should we take thought, He passes

6 Attwater, op. cit., p. 33

7 Homily 7 in Prevost, op. cit., p. 106.

8 Matt. 6, 25-26

9 Matt. 6, 28

on in what follows to that which is easier. For raiment is not so necessary as food."¹⁰ Thus he reminds his listeners of what he had spoken in his last homily and makes a transition to the one he is about to preach. But this procedure is rare.

Usually he begins at once with the text to be discussed. He probably felt that the beginning of his sermon was too important to be used for making connections. He wanted to catch their interest and attention at once, with a new text to be explained. It seems that his hearers complained of this; hence, in a special digression he explained what he wanted them to do. He said, in Homily 5:

Do you not see how your children study the whole day the lessons assigned to them? This then let us do likewise, since otherwise we shall derive no profit from coming here, drawing water daily into a vessel with holes, and not bestowing on the retaining of what we have heard, even so much earnestness, as we plainly show with respect to gold and silver. For anyone who has received a few denaria, puts them into a bag, and sets a seal thereon; but we having received oracles more precious than either gold or precious stones, and receiving the treasures of the Spirit, do not put them away in the storehouses of our soul, but thoughtlessly and at random let them escape from our minds. . . . Therefore, let us write it down as an unalterable law for ourselves to give up this one day of the week entirely to hearing, and to the recollection of the things we have heard. . . . For this contributes no little towards the understanding of what is said, when you know accurately the connection of the thoughts, which we are busy weaving together for you. For since it is impossible to set down all in one day, you must by continued remembrance make the things laid before you on many days into a kind of chain, and so wrap it around your soul: that the body of the Scriptures may appear entire.¹¹

Coherence.

There is a very close connection between unity and coherence. Whatever destroys the unity of a composition necessarily destroys its coherence.

¹⁰ Homily 22 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 329

¹¹ Homily 5 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 67

Unity is to coherence what a hook in a rafter is to a chain. The series of links must be suspended from one place before they can hang one from the other. Coherence then requires that the parts of a composition shall hang one attached to the other. It welds the parts of a discourse together making clear their relation to each other and to the whole. The separate parts must follow one another naturally and logically. Two conditions are essential for achieving this smooth flow of thought. First, the thoughts must be related, and secondly, the expression of these thoughts must show their relationship. The most effective means for accomplishing the latter is the use of connectives: words, phrases, and clauses. Even whole paragraphs may be necessary to make transitions when a mental gap has to be filled so the mind may ride smoothly from one idea to another.

First, then, the ideas must be related; where they are not so related, a suitable middle term must be found to bridge the thoughts. And this is where the homily taxes the ingenuity of the preacher; his great problem is to make the moral lesson follow from the text he has belaboured. Chrysostom does this very well. For instance, on the text "Flee into Egypt" in the eighth homily, he makes one application from the word flee:

For no crime His mother is exiled into the land of the Barbarians; that you, if you do good . . . and suffer ill . . . , should [never] say: "What can this be? Yet surely I ought to be crowned and celebrated, for fulfilling the Lord's commandment"; but that having this example, you might bear all things nobly.¹²

And then he makes a second application on Egypt, saying that now it is a bright spot in the Christian world whereas formerly it grovelled in superstition and paganism; next he praises the holiness of the Egyptian monks,

¹² Homily 8 in Prevost, op. cit., p. 110

especially St. Anthony. And he concludes that

. . . nothing was to any one of these an hindrance in the race of virtue . . . [so we too should] make neither place, nor education, nor the wickedness of our forefathers an excuse. . . . Let us then, bearing in mind all these things, put out of the way these our superfluous pleas and excuses, and apply ourselves to those toils which the cause of virtue requires. . . .¹³

Another example of coherent, closely reasoned thought is had in the application of the indifference of Jerusalem towards the birth of Christ to Antioch's passion for the theatre. He does this through the following steps: First, he contrasts the coldness of the Jews to the fire of the Wisemen, and our coldness to things spiritual with the fire of St. Paul and the first Christians. Then he points out that we need to be warmed by tears and compunction after the example of Anna, St. Paul, Our Lord, and the Saints. Not that Christianity is opposed to laughter, but only immoderate laughter because this dissipates the mind, which in turn leads to weakness and sensuality, and these are at once the causes and effects of the theatre where the jokes are coarse and the sights worse. All of which leads to the grossest immorality. But let Chrysostom speak for himself in Homily 6:

Although troubled, [the Jews] seek not to see what has happened, neither do they follow the Wisemen, nor make any particular enquiry . . . so great was their dullness . . . But we are grown more cold than a cinder, and more lifeless than the dead. . . . And this when we see Paul soaring above the Heaven, . . . and more fervent than any flame. . . . But if that example be too much for you, in the first place, your saying this itself comes from sloth; for what had Paul more than you? . . . However, . . . let us . . . consider the first believers who cast away . . . goods . . . and devoted themselves to God . . . and thenceforth abided in continual compunction, pouring forth never-ceasing fountains of tears. . . . For nothing so binds and unites men to God, as do such tears. . . . If you also weep thus, you become a follower of your Lord. Yea, for He also wept. . . . And these things I say not

to suppress all laughter, but only to take away dissipation of mind. . . . For this is not the theatre for laughter, neither did we come together for this intent that we may give way to immoderate mirth, but that we may groan, and by this groaning inherit a kingdom. . . . It becometh not us then to be laughing continually, and to be dissolute, and luxurious, but it belongs to those upon the stage. . . . Yet it is chiefly you who supply the principle and root of such lawlessness. . . . For not even he who acts these things is so much the offender, as you before him: you who bid him make a play on these things, . . . taking delight, and laughing, and praising what is done, and in every way gaining strength for such workshops of the devil. . . .¹⁴

Coherent expression of thought is obtained in large measure through the use of connectives. These little words are slipped in so easily and gracefully by the speaker as to escape the notice of the hearers, but they serve a very important function in showing the relation of thoughts to each other. They are like the nails in a case, invisible, but holding the whole thing together. It is a little startling to note that in the first paragraph of Homily 6 consisting of twenty-two sentences, seventy-four separate connectives appear:

. . . ὥστε . . . , καὶ . . . , καὶ . . . , καὶ . . . , καὶ . . . , καὶ . . .
καὶ Μᾶλλον δὲ . . . , εἰ . . . πρότερον ἢ Καὶ . . .
γὰρ . . . ὥστε καὶ εὐτεῖς θεν Τί οὖν . . . ; Ἰδοὺ, φησὶ,
καὶ Πῶς οὖν εἰ . . . καὶ . . . καὶ . . . καὶ . . . ; Τί
δὲ καὶ . . . ; Καὶ μὴν . . . καθὼς καὶ Οὐδὲν γοῦν . . .
οὐδὲ γὰρ . . . , οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . .
ἀλλὰ . . . καὶ Εἰ δὲ καὶ . . . ; Οὐ γὰρ δὴ . . . , ἀλλ'
. . . ὥς φασίν Οὗτοι δὲ οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . .
. . . ἀλλ' . . . ὅπερ καὶ Τίς γὰρ . . . ; Εἰ μὲν γὰρ . . .
. . . μὲν οὐδὲ οὕτω Καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὲν . . . καὶ . . . καὶ . . .
. . . Νυνὶ δὲ οὐδὲ . . . , ἀλλὰ . . . καὶ . . . οὔτε ἤδη . . . ,
καὶ . . . , καὶ . . . , καὶ . . . ; Καὶ γὰρ καὶ . . . , καὶ . . .
'Αλλ' οὐ 'Αλλ' οὐκ ἂν Εἰ γὰρ καὶ . . . οὐκ ἂν . . .
. . . , ὅτι . . . , καὶ . . . καὶ τότε . . . , οὐχὶ . . . ὅπερ καὶ
αὐτὸ . . . , καὶ . . . μὲν . . . καὶ . . . καὶ . . . δὲ . . .

14 Homily 6 in Prevost, op. cit., pp. 85-91

15 Homily 6 in Migne, op. cit., v. 57, cols. 61-63

St. Francis de Sales makes a special point about these connectives.

He says:

The structure of the discourse should be natural, without preface or studied ornament. I approve of saying, "In the first place--in the second place," that the people may perceive the plan.¹⁶

Chrysostom often avails himself of this simple device. In Homily 6 he says:

". . . that this star was . . . not a star at all, but some invisible power transformed into this appearance, is in the first place¹⁷ evident from its very course. . . ."18 The next paragraph begins with: "In the second place,¹⁷ one may see this from the time also. . . ."19 The third paragraph begins, "In the third place,¹⁷ from its appearing and hiding itself again. . . ."20 The fourth paragraph begins, "In the fourth place,¹⁷ one may perceive this clearly, from its mode of pointing Him out. . . ."21 In Homily 34 Chrysostom is listing some providential reasons for the decay of the body. He says: "In the first place . . . In the second place . . . Thirdly . . . Fourthly . . . Fifthly . . . Sixthly . . . Seventhly . . ."22

16 St. Francis de Sales, Letter on Preaching, No. 31 (Vol. 1 of Letters of St. Francis, Paris, 1676)--Printed in Instructions on Preaching by the Saints, Translated by P. Boyle, (New York: Benziger, 1902) p. 68.

17 Italics not in the text.

18 Homily 6 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 80.

19 Ibid., p. 80

20 Ibid., p. 80

21 Ibid., p. 80

22 Ibid., v. 2, p. 503

Whole sentences are also used to connect paragraphs. The first paragraph of the sixth Homily previews what he will say, his last point being that the enemies of the truth misinterpret the appearance of the star. The whole argument that follows is to show how absurd a natural explanation of the star would be. The second paragraph begins: "What then do they allege from the appearance of the star? . . . That astrology can be depended on. . . ."23 The next paragraph contrasts what the Wisemen learn from this same star, and begins, "And what however do the Wisemen learn from the star itself? Surely not that he was a king. . . ."24 The fourth paragraph opens, "And even if they knew Him to be a King, for what intent are they come?"25 The first sentence of the next paragraph continues the thought: "Which circumstance in itself would afford a still greater difficulty even than the former."26 The rest of the paragraph elaborates the difficulty of the journey. The sixth paragraph answers an objection to the preceding: "But these men did not foresee this."27 The answer is expanded, so that the next paragraph logically questions, "And why did they at all worship one who was in swaddling clothes?"28 The argument is a reductio ad absurdum. And this is pressed on in the eighth paragraph, the opening sentence making the

23 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 77

24 Loc. cit.

25 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 78

26 Loc. cit.

27 Loc. cit.

28 Loc. cit.

connection: "But if this be foolish, what follows is much more foolish."²⁹ The next paragraph relentlessly presses the absurdity still further, "And for what purpose did they worship Him at all?"³⁰ The tenth paragraph makes the transition for the correct interpretation:

Do you see how many absurdities appear, if we examine these transactions according to the course of human things, and ordinary custom? For not only these topics, but more than these could be mentioned, containing more matter for questions than what we have spoken of. But lest, stringing questions upon questions, we should bewilder you, come, let us now enter upon the solution of the matters inquired of, making a beginning of our solution with the star itself.³¹

Whole paragraphs may function transitionally to secure coherence as well as clearness for the whole speech. The paragraph above is an excellent example. Another may be quoted from Homily 16 to show how careful Chrysostom is that his audience follow the trend of his argument. He says:

But these things we have said, as one might say them incidentally, concerning all the commandments. Now we must go on to that which is before us, and keep to the thread of what has been affirmed: "He that is angry with his brother"³²

Clearness.

The third basic quality of all rhetoric is clearness. It is indeed necessary in all types of writing, but it must be so perfect in oratory that the hearers not only can easily understand what is said, but cannot help understanding it, as we see the sun on a clear day without looking for it. In reading a book a person can read over a second time what he has failed to understand the first time; but it is not so when he listens to a

29 Ibid. p. 79

30 Loc. cit.

31 Loc. cit.

32 Homily 16, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, pp. 239-240.

speech. Here the burden of making himself understood lies mainly on the speaker. Quintilian says:

For my own part, I regard clearness as the first essential of good style. . . . [T]he whole matter [must] be plain and obvious even to a not too attentive audience. . . . [W]hat we say [should] be so clear that our words will thrust themselves into his [the judge's] mind even when he is not giving us his attention, just as sunlight forces itself upon the eyes. Therefore our aim must be not to put him in a position to understand our argument, but to force him to understand it.³³

Hence the orator must adapt his talks to his audience. He must know, for instance, what illustrations will suit their minds. If the example is less understood by the audience than the subject of the discussion, it serves only to confound the issue. It goes without saying that Chrysostom knew his people, their circumstances and predilections, their weaknesses and their virtues, their views and prejudices, their interests and aspirations. His favorite examples are taken from the sea and the gymnasium. From the sea--because Antioch was a port town, built upon the south bank of the river Orontes, not far from the sea, trading with all parts of the world, so that sailors and ships were the most familiar objects of comparison. Thus he says in Homily 15:

Do you not see the sailors, how, when they see anyone meeting with shipwreck, they spread their sails, and set out with all haste, to rescue those of the same craft out of the waves? Now if partakers of an art show so much care one for another, how much more ought they, who are partakers of the same nature, to do all these things! Because in truth here too is a shipwreck, a more grievous one than that; for either a man under provocation blasphemes, and so throws all away; or he for-

³³ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, VIII, 2, 22-24: "Nobis prima sit virtus perspicuitas. . . . [Omnia debent esse] dilucida et negligenter quoque audientibus aperta. . . . tam clara fuerint quae dicemus, ut in animum ejus oratio, ut sol in oculos, etiamsi in eam non intendatur, incurrat. Quare non, ut intelligere possit, sed, ne omnino possit non intelligere, curandum." Translated by Butler, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 210, 211.

swears himself under the sway of his wrath, and that way falls into hell or he strikes a blow and commits murder, and thus again suffers the very same shipwreck. Go then, and put a stop to the evil; pull out those who are drowning, though you descend into the very depth of the wave; and having broken up the theatre of the devil, take each one of them apart, and admonish him to quell the flame, and to lull the waves.³⁴

Chrysostom also favors examples from the gymnasium and athletic games because these were so dear to the hearts of the Greeks. Thus we read in Homily 20:

Nay, they will not so much as imitate them that wrestle in the Olympic games,³⁵ who although so great a multitude is sitting there, and so many princes, desire only to please one, even him who adjudges the victory among them; and this, though he be much their inferior. But you, though you have a two-fold motive for displaying the victory to Him, first, that He is the person to adjudge it, and also, that He is beyond comparison superior to all that are sitting in the theatre. . . .³⁶

And in Homily 33:

For when no one exercises himself in the wrestling school, how will he be distinguished in the contests? What champion, not being used to the Trainer, will be able, when summoned by the Olympic contests,³⁷ to show anything great and noble against his antagonist? Ought we not every day do wrestle and fight and run? Do you not see those who are called Pentathli, when they have no antagonist, filling a sack with much sand, and hanging it up trying their full strength thereupon, and they that are still younger practise upon their companions. These do you also emulate, and practise the wrestling of self-denial.³⁸

³⁴ Homily 15, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, pp. 219-220. Cf. infra, p. 123 an excellent example in which Chrysostom compares the "seven ages of man" to the sea.

³⁵ Homily 20, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 288: Καὶ οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς Ὀλυμπιακοῖς ἀγῶσι παλαίοντας μιμεῖσθαι ἐθέλουσιν, . . .

The last recorded Olympic games are of the year 220 A.D., and it is very doubtful whether the games continued after that date. Nevertheless this and similar references to the Olympics seem to refer to something the Greeks could see in the fourth century.

³⁶ Homily 20, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 308.

³⁷ Homily 33, Migne, op. cit., v. 33, col. 395: τῶν Ὀλυμπιακῶν ἀγῶνων. Cf. supra, p. 68, footnote 35.

³⁸ Homily 33, Prevost, op. cit., v. 2, p. 490.

Above all Chrysostom knew the human heart. His was the knowledge acquired not from the mere precepts of a teacher, nor from the writings of philosophers, nor again by the extensive reading of literary works. It was rather by intercourse with his fellow-men, and especially by self-introspection and the scrutiny of his own heart³⁹ that he acquired a knowledge of human nature no books can teach, and which discovered to him the secret springs of human actions. His perception of the devious rationalizations, to which a mind addicted to the theatre will resort, is well exemplified in Homily 6:

Tell me then, with what eyes will you look upon your wife at home, after having seen her insulted there? . . . No, do not tell me, that what is done is acting; for it is just this acting that has made many adulterers, and subverted many families. And for this I most especially grieve, that what is done does not even seem evil, but instead there is much applause and clamor and laughter at the commission of so foul adultery. What's that you say? that what is done is acting? Why, for this very reason they must be worthy of ten thousand deaths, that those things which all laws command men to flee, they have taken pains to imitate. For if the thing itself be bad, the imitation thereof, is also bad. And I do not mention how many adulterers they make, who act these scenes of adultery, how they render the spectators of such things bold and shameless; for nothing is more full of whoredom and boldness than an eye that endures to look at such things.

And if you would not choose to see a woman stripped naked in a market-place, not even in a house, but would call such a thing an outrage, how can you go into the theatre, to insult the common nature of men and women, and disgrace your own eyes? For do not say that she, that is stripped, is a harlot; the nature is the same, and the bodies are alike, both that of the harlot and that of the free-woman. . . . Or is it that when we are apart, then such a thing is outrageous, but when we are assembled and all sitting together, it is no longer equally shameful? No, this is absurdity and a disgrace and words of the utmost madness; and it were better to besmear the eyes all over with mud and mire, than to be a spectator of such a transgression. For surely mire is not so much a hurt to an eye, as an unchaste sight, and the spectacle of a woman stripped naked.⁴⁰

39 He had been a monk for four years and a hermit for two more.

40 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., pp. 91-92.

Besides possessing this insight into the heart of man, the preacher must command the mechanics of rhetoric which contribute to clearness, such as the use of connectives, forecasting, and other devices.

Chrysostom's use of connectives was sufficiently elaborated under coherence, but his use of the forecast is worthy of attention. Thus, when he realizes the road they are about to pursue is complicated, he outlines his plan of treatment, as in Homily 6:

. . . that we may learn who these Wisemen were, and whence they came, and how; and at whose persuasion, and what was the star. Or rather . . . let us first bring forward what the enemies of the truth say.⁴¹

Then he takes up one by one the false interpretations. Having disposed of the objections he reverts to his original outline and asks, "What the star was, and of what kind, and whether it might be one of the common stars, or new and unlike the rest, and whether it was a star by nature or a star in appearance only?"⁴² These questions being answered, he goes on to explain who the Wisemen were, "why they were called by a star?" and "who stirred them up to this?"⁴³ and "why only these three and not all wisemen of the east?"⁴⁴ This method of previewing what is to come makes the sermon easy to follow.

Other devices making for clearness are the use of the simile, the metaphor, the comparison, the question and answer, the arsis and thesis, the correction, the parenthesis, the hypophora, and the prokatalepsis.

41 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., p. 77

42 Ibid. p. 80

43 Ibid. p. 80

44 Ibid. p. 82

These figures also contribute to emphasis and movement. With exception of correction and parenthesis, all these figures appear in each of the homilies. But to make the most telling exposition, all the illustrations will be taken from one homily: the sixth.

The use of the simile and metaphor serves to translate an abstract theological idea into concrete terms. These are so abundant in Chrysostom as to defy any comprehensive treatment for all the homilies. In the sixth homily he uses the following:

the devil has blown upon them so violent a blast . . .
 stop the mouths of demons . . .
 kindle endless warfare . . .
 He opens the door to the gentiles . . .
 he must be more fervent than fire . . .
 we are grown colder than a cinder, more lifeless than the dead . . .
 we see Paul soaring above the heaven, more fervent than any flame. . .
 the warmth of that fire entering the soul casts out all sluggishness,
 and makes him more light than anything that soars . . .
 pouring forth never-ceasing fountains of tears, and then reaping
 fruit of great delight . . .
 such a one dwelling in the cities spends his time as in a desert . . .
 for much as after a violent burst of rain, there is a clear open
 sky, so likewise when tears are pouring down, a calm arises, and
 serenity, and the darkness that ensues on our sins quite disappears . . .
 her tears alone uttered a cry more clear than any trumpet . . .
 God also opened her womb, and made the hard rock a fruitful field . . .
 for this is not the theatre for laughter . . .
 mire is not so hurtful to the eye as an unchaste sight . . .
 I have also made my language stronger, that by cutting deeper I
 might free you from the venom of those who intoxicate you. . .
 workshops of the devil . . .
 for the moon straightway hides herself . . .
 the flood came and wrought common shipwreck of the world . . .
 those who are enrolled into the City above . . .
 those who bear spiritual arms . . .
 soften the nerves of their zeal . . .
 drawing on their heads the furnace of fire . . .
 standing by a king you do not allow yourself even to smile; but
 having the Lord of Angels dwelling in you, yet you laugh when He is
 displeased . . .
 for while before the temporal tribunal be your weeping ever so
 abundant, you cannot escape punishment after the sentence--here, on the

contrary, should you only sigh, you annul the sentence and obtain pardon . . .

for a grievous conflict is at hand, and against the powers unseen is our wrestling . . . and it were well for us if we can sustain that savage phalanx⁴⁵

A total of seven comparisons or instances appears in this homily; and it is interesting to note that the majority of Chrysostom's examples are taken from the Old Testament. Some of these are elaborated to show the point of similarity; in others he presumes this to be evident:

As He acted in the case of the Ninevites He did with the Magi. . .⁴⁶

As in the case of the Samaritan and Canaanitish women . . .⁴⁷

Thus He also did with respect to them of Ascalon and Gaza . . .⁴⁸

For what took place with respect to the witch, is again like this sort of dispensation . . .⁴⁹

Which same thing He did in the case of Cyrus . . .⁵⁰

Tears such as were Hanna's . . .⁵¹

Such were they at Sodom, such were they at the time of the Deluge . . .⁵²

Chrysostom is very lavish in his use of questions in all his homilies. In this sixth Homily alone there are fifty-one questions. Of these, ten can be classed as the figure dialektikon, which asks a question followed

45 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., pp. 77-92, passim.

46 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., p. 82

47 Loc. cit.

48 Ibid., p. 83

49 Loc. cit.

50 Ibid. p. 84

51 Ibid. p. 87

52 Ibid. p. 89

by an answer. This is a very useful device, especially when it rephrases the preceding idea and advances the thought another step. It helps make the development clear and coherent, besides adding to movement and stimulating interest. The following are typical:

What then do they allege? "Behold," say they, "this is a sign that astrology can be depended on."⁵³

Whence then will these points be manifest? From the very things that are written. . . .⁵⁴

And to what intent did it appear? To reprove the Jews for their insensibility. . . .⁵⁵

Why, what should He have done? Sent Prophets? But the Magi would not have submitted to Phophets. Uttered a voice from above? No, they would not have attended. Sent an Angel? But even him they would have hurried by. And so dismissing all those means, God calls them by the things that are familiar.⁵⁶

Another figure extremely common in the homilies is the arsis and thesis. It makes the thought clear and emphatic by stating it once negatively and then immediately restating it positively. Sometimes the order is reversed but not often. Twenty-four examples of this figure were found in the sixth Homily. Of the seven which are quoted here, the sixth is the very rare positive-negative type; and the last example is an accumulated negative with one positive, which is exceptionally forceful.

These things I say not to suppress all laughter, but to take away dissipation of mind⁵⁷

It appears not in the night, but in midday⁵⁸

53 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., p. 77

54 Ibid. p. 80

55 Ibid. p. 81

56 Ibid. p. 82

57 Ibid. p. 88

58 Ibid. p. 80

Not even so are they worthy of honor, but of punishment⁵⁹

It does not seem to me to be the work of the star only, but also of God⁶⁰

Tears which are shed not for display, but in compunction⁶¹

This one may often see Him do, but nowhere laugh⁶²

Not them that are called unto heaven, not them that are enrolled into the City above, not them that bear spiritual arms, but them that are enlisted on the devil's side. . . .⁶³

There are three examples of correction or epidiorthisis in this homily. Sometimes the correction denies what was said, or restricts the meaning, or enlarges it. All three types are illustrated by the following examples:

That this star was not of the common sort, or rather not a star at all, as it seems to me at least, but some invisible power transformed into this appearance⁶⁴

A spot so small, being only as much as a shed would occupy, or rather as much as the body of a little infant would take up, could not possibly be marked out by a star⁶⁵

Thou who biddest him make a play on these things, or rather who not only biddest him, but art even zealous about it⁶⁶

Likewise three instances of parenthesis occur, where Chrysostom interrupts the thought by inserting some explanatory clauses. These may be

59 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., p. 74

60 Ibid. p. 84

61 Ibid. p. 87

62 Ibid. p. 88

63 Ibid. p. 90

64 Ibid. p. 80

65 Ibid. p. 81

66 Ibid. p. 91

found in Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, Vol. 57, Column 66, lines 27 to 39; col. 66, lines 18-21; and col. 68, lines 10-12.

Chrysostom is very fair in his explanations; he tries to face every objection. He says:

If I see you thoroughly awakened, and eager to learn, I will try to add the solution also; but if gaping, and not attending, I will conceal both the difficulties, and their solution . . .⁶⁷

Now there are two ways in which he anticipates an objection. It may be phrased as a question or as a statement, and then answered. The former is called an hypophora, and the latter a prokatalepsis. There are three examples of the figure hypophora:

"Why," one may say, "if I did not so, but mourned, what would be the profit?" Very great indeed; even so great that it is not possible so much as to set it forth by word.⁶⁸

But cf. also Migne, Patrologiae Graecae, Vol. 57, col. 69, lines 3-8; and col. 72, lines 20-30. There were four figures of prokatalepsis. This is one:

Nay, tell me not, that what is done is acting; for this acting has made many adulterers.⁶⁹

Cf. also Migne, op. cit., vol. 57, col. 63, lines 24-29; col. 70, lines 42-55; and col. 72, lines 20-35.

Little more need be said about unity, coherence, and clearness. The homily has unity from the end it is to achieve--the moral reformation of men. It achieves this by applying the word of God to men's practical lives. If Chrysostom makes more than one application of the text to men's lives,

⁶⁷ Homily 1, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 13

⁶⁸ Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 88

⁶⁹ Homily 6, Ibid. p. 91

he can easily defend himself that all men's lives are different and require different applications, while he has but one sermon to preach. Ever since Theophrastus remarked that an "unbridled horse ought to be trusted sooner than a badly arranged discourse,"⁷⁰ and Plato said that

δεῖν πάντα λόγον ὥπερ ζῷον συνεστάναι σῶμά τι ἔχοντα αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ, ὥστε μήτε ἀκέφαλον εἶναι μήτε ἄπουν, ἀλλὰ μέσα τε ἔχειν καὶ ἄκρα, πρέποντ' ἀλλήλοις καὶ τῷ ὅλῳ γεγραμμένα⁷¹.

rhetoricians have been at great pains to devise the certain parts which contribute to the formation of a whole artistic piece, and have given instruction as to the order in which these parts shall appear. For it is true that the most impressive and truthful matter conceivable can lose lustre and attractiveness through faulty organization, just as, conversely, perfect organization can never transform drivel into shining truth. It does make a difference whether material combines into a unified whole or remains an inchoate mass of disjointed particulars; yet under no circumstances should the arrangement of the several parts of a speech be regarded as an independent virtue. It must be regarded as a means--not a terminal value. Hence, Aristotle believed that "the only indispensable parts of a speech

⁷⁰ Quoted in Thonssen and Baird, Greek Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Co., c. 1908) p. 392.

⁷¹ Plato, ΦΑΙΔΡΟΣ, 264, C. Translated by Henry Cary. Edited by W. H. Thompson (London: Whittaker and Co., 1868), pp. 103-104: "[E]very speech ought to be put together like a living creature, which has a body of its own, so as to be neither without head, nor without feet, but to have both a middle and extremities, described proportionately to each other and to the whole . . ."

are the statement of the case and the proof."⁷² Similarly for the homily all that is needed is the explanation of the text followed by the application.

Clearness or perspicuity is the first virtue of a speech. It renders the thought intelligible. Far from being not clear, Perthes⁷³ says that in seeking to be understood, Chrysostom sins by excess: too often repeating the same thought, adding too many explanatory remarks, being too detailed in description, and excessively multiplying examples and similitudes. It is true that a speaker may use more examples than are necessary or desirable; he may use more epigrammatic statements than can properly be understood by the hearers in a limited time; he may make more appeals to visual imagery than can have any appreciable effect upon the ability of the hearers to comprehend a given thought. But the point at which the speaker can strike the balance between excess and defect, the point on which there is neither too much nor too little, whether of illustrations, or long sentences, or figures is difficult to determine. It is variable with each speaker and each speech situation. It is a personal matter of which the speaker is the best judge. Even Perthes when he hurls his stone is quick to soften the hurt by saying: "These defects are sufficiently important in themselves to furnish us warning, while yet their shadow is by no means deep enough to darken essentially the radiant light of his eloquence."⁷⁴ This much has been said in behalf of the homily as it refers to the mind--ut veritas pateat. The next chapter takes into consideration the appeal to the heart--ut veritas placeat.

⁷² Quoted in Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 398.

⁷³ F. Perthes, Life of John Chrysostom (Boston: John Jewett & Co., 1854) p. 239.

⁷⁴ Perthes, op. cit., p. 239.

CHAPTER IV

UT PLACEAT

Quintilian, in the eighth book of his Institutes of Oratory, says:

. . . a speaker wins but trifling praise if he does no more than speak with correctness and lucidity; in fact his speech seems rather to be free from blemish than to have any positive merit. . . . On the other hand, by the employment of skilful ornament the orator commends himself at the same time, and whereas his other accomplishments appeal to the considered judgment of the learned, this gift appeals to the enthusiastic approval of the world at large, and the speaker who possesses it fights not merely with effective but flashing weapons. . . . But rhetorical ornament contributes not a little to the furtherance of our case as well. For when our audience find it a pleasure to listen, their attention and their readiness to believe what they hear are both alike increased, while they are generally filled with delight, and sometimes even transported by admiration. . . . Cicero was right when, in one of his letters to Brutus, he wrote, "Eloquence which evokes no admiration is, in my opinion, unworthy of the name."¹

An opposite view, however, is held by St. Francis de Sales for sacred oratory:

When in the pulpit . . . the preacher should say in his heart: Ego veni ut isti vitam habeant et abundantius habeant. Now to succeed in this aim and purpose, two things are requisite: to instruct and to persuade. To instruct as to virtues and vices: to cause the former to be loved and practised, and the latter to be detested, resisted and avoided: in a word, to impart light to the understanding and fervour to the will. . . . I am aware that some add a third end, and say that a preacher should please. For my part I make a distinction, and I say that there is a pleasure which arises from instruction and persuasion: for who is so insensible as not to feel great pleasure in being well and holily instructed concerning the way that leads to heaven? . . . As for this pleasure it should be sought. But it is not distinct from instruction and persuasion: it is a consequence of it. There is another kind of pleasure, which does not depend on instruction and persuasion, but is distinct from them and very often hinders them. It is a certain gratification of the ears arising from a certain elegance--secular, worldly

¹ Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, VIII, 3, 2-6. Translated by

H. E. Butler, op. cit., v. 3, pp. 211, 213.

and profane--of unusual terms, ornamental descriptions, words and phrases but all the result of artifice. As to this, I strongly and firmly maintain that a preacher ought not to aim at it. It should be left to secular orators, to charlatans, to flatterers who take delight in such things. They preach not Christ crucified, but themselves. . . . St. Paul detests hearers prurientes auribus, and consequently the preachers who desire to please them. This is pedantry. I do not desire that people should say after the sermon: "What a great orator! What a fine memory he has! How learned he is!" But I desire that they should say: "How beautiful penance is--how necessary! O God! how good and how just Thou art!"²

But with all due respect to St. Francis de Sales, it is no use to speak out plainly and honestly if it be done in a clumsy and halting fashion, for then those whom the preacher wishes to touch will only laugh at him. And St. Chrysostom realized this only too well. Among those hellenized people, many of them shallow-minded and flighty of spirit, there was an ever-present tendency to be less interested in what the preacher said than in how he said it; and according to him,

People behave at a sermon like spectators at a circus; they appraise a discourse in terms of their opinion of the speaker's oratorical powers.³

And he added:

For the things here present are no dramatic spectacle; neither are you sitting gazing on actors, that you may merely applaud. This place is a spiritual school.⁴

Time and again he declared:

No, I want not applause, nor tumults, nor noise. One thing only do I wish, that quietly and intelligently listening, you do what is said. This is the applause, this the panegyric for me.⁵

2 St. Francis de Sales, Letter on Preaching, No. 31 (Vol. 1 of Letters of St. Francis, Paris, 1676) printed in Instructions on Preaching by the Saints, Translated by P. Boyle, (New York: Benziger, 1902) pp. 46-47.

3 Quoted in Attwater, op. cit., p. 31.

4 Homily 17, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 267

5 Loc. cit.

ut he does not for this reason abandon beauty of style. It can be put to good use in the service of God. St. John of the Cross in his Ascent of Mount Carmel says:

It was not the intention of the Apostles, nor is it mine, to forbid purity of style, the art of rhetoric or nobleness of eloquence: these things are real advantages, always powerful whenever and wherever found.⁶

It seems then that the sermon or homily should accord a certain amount of pleasure to the listeners. How is this pleasure to be achieved? Coppens answers:

The pleasure which the hearers derive from an excellent oration results from a variety of causes all harmoniously blended together; as the beauty of a garden, or a painting, or a group of statuary does not consist in one or two features only, but in the excellence of all the details and the perfect proportion in which the whole is combined. It is the same with all the works of art, and in particular with the productions of eloquence. The beauty of an oration, and consequently the pleasure which it is able to impart, implies great perfection in all particulars--felicity in the invention and choice of proofs; a happy arrangement or combination of parts; richness and clearness of development; elegant and appropriate expression--so that not only conviction or persuasion is attained where either of these is intended, but their success is accomplished with a certain gracefulness or splendor which cannot but delight the audience.⁷

To sum up: beauty of style, while less important in a homily than clearness or force, is still not a negligible factor. It even contributes to the other two. It results from a sense of order, harmony, and loveliness conveyed. It has many components. Unity, coherence, and clearness are some. We now consider three more: Variety, Interest, and Elegance.

⁶ Quoted in J. K. Sharp, Next Sunday's Sermon (Philadelphia: Dolphin, 1940) p. 11.

⁷ Charles Coppens, Oratorical Composition (New York: Schwartz, Irwin, and Fauss, 1885) p. 156.

Variety.

Variety is the spice of composition. It gives zest and creates interest, and therefore holds attention. Through variety the preacher appeals to all the mental faculties of the hearers. Variety goes from authority to reason, from imagination to experience, from Gospel to anecdote. It draws on history, scripture, science, current events. It mingles sublimity of thought with familiar allusions; it blends heaven and earth. The use of any figure of speech promotes variety, but most figures are not used specifically to create variety. Thus a writer may use a comparison for clearness, or a pleonasm for emphasis, or a hyperbole for force, or asyndeton for movement, and incidentally achieve variety in his composition. Perhaps the only figures aimed directly at securing variety are the digression, quotation, antonomasia, preterition.

As was pointed out in the chapter on unity,⁸ Chrysostom secures variety of thought by treating many subjects in one sermon. This was feasible in the amount of time he had at his disposal, and excusable from the diversified nature of his audience. But these different lessons which he draws from the text can hardly be called digressions. A digression really is a departure from the main line of thought to secure a special present advantage with a return to the original line of thought. Only occasionally is there a real digression in Chrysostom; he usually manages to weave everything into a connected whole. However, the fourth Homily on Genesis has a real digression:

⁸ Supra, p. 58

Please listen to me--you are not paying attention. I am talking to you about the Holy Scriptures and you are looking at the lamps and the people lighting them. It is very frivolous to be more interested in what the lamplighters are doing than in what the preacher is saying. After all, I am lighting a lamp too--the lamp of God's word. . . .⁹

Possibly after the general figure of question, the most frequently used device in Chrysostom is the quotation. His familiarity with the Sacred Scriptures is astonishing; quotations from the Bible sparkle in his homilies like stars in the night. Almost five hundred quotations from the Old Testament and eight hundred from the New appear in these ninety homilies, thus averaging nearly fifteen for each. This computation does not include the text under discussion, and it must be remembered each text of the quotation is repeated several times. Perhaps this figure is listed wrongly under variety, for a quotation from the Holy Scriptures will emphasize and bolster the previous statement. Sometimes this may be necessary. But, often enough, Chrysostom tacks on a quotation even when there is no necessity to prove an obvious and accepted truth, so that the only excuse for it is variety. An example of this is in Homily 16 when speaking of the sinlessness of Christ, he says:

For, that He did fulfill all [the law, by transgressing none of its precepts] hear what He said to John, FOR THUS IT BECOMETH US TO FULFILL ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS. [Capitalization used for scriptural quotations.] And to the Jews also He said, WHICH OF YOU CONVINCETH ME OF SIN? And to His disciples again, THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD COMETH, AND FINDETH NOTHING IN ME. And the Prophet too from the first had said that HE DID NO SIN . . . And He did the same through us also . . . Which thing Paul also declaring said, CHRIST IS THE END OF THE LAW FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS TO EVERY ONE THAT BELIEVETH. And he said also that HE JUDGED SIN IN THE FLESH, THAT THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE LAW MIGHT BE FULFILLED IN US WHO WALK NOT AFTER THE FLESH. And again, DO WE THEN MAKE VOID THE LAW

9 Quoted in Attwater, op. cit., p. 34.

THROUGH FAITH? GOD FORBID! YES, WE ESTABLISH THE LAW.¹⁰

Of the tropes, metonymy or antonomasia belongs here, and, perhaps under elegance. Hence, it is not to be expected, at least in its elaborate forms, frequently in the ordinary homily. Thus there are but two in Homily 90: "When He was alive, they purchased His Blood . . ."¹¹ and: "How long before you enslave the Mammon that enslaved you . . ."¹² And where the figure does occur often, it is a simple one. Thus in Homily 17 he calls the devil "Evil one" nine times. Occasionally as in Homily 20 he calls Christ the "Teacher" and the "Sun of Righteousness" and in Homily 23 "O Thou Only-begotten Son of God." God is called in Homily 13 "Infinite Wisdom" and "Unspeakable Love" and in Homily 16--"The Legislator." An accumulation of metonymy with polysyndeton appears in Homily 32: "But we have the same City, and the same House, and Table, and Way, and Door, and Root, and Life, and Head, and the same Shepherd and King, and Teacher, and Judge, and Maker, and Father. . . ."¹³

Rarer still is the figure of paraleipsis. Paraleipsis is a figure in which an author pretends to pass over a point in silence but actually expresses it. We find a rare example of it in the sixth Homily:

And I do not mention how many adulterers they make, who act this scene of adultery, how they render the spectators of such things bold and shameless. . . .¹⁴

¹⁰ The texts quoted here are, in order: Matt. 3, 15; John 8, 46; John 14, 30; Isaias 53, 9; Romans 10, 4; Romans 8, 3-4; Romans 3, 31. The quotation is from Homily 16 in Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 228.

¹¹ Homily 90, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1168

¹² Homily 90, Ibid., p. 1172

¹³ Homily 32, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 476

¹⁴ Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 91

Interest.

The second element in ut homilia placeat is interest. It is extremely important. It is preliminary to clearness and force, awakening, as it does, and holding the attention, while the mind is instructed and the will aroused. Since it comes in beats, the main thought must be amplified and repeated in various ways till it fills the mind and shuts out competing thoughts. That is to say, variety of presentation holds interest. And in as much as the use of any figure makes for variety, it also contributes to interest. Besides variety of presentation, there are three other means specifically designed to endow a homily with interest: contact, concreteness, and stimulation of curiosity.

If he is to speak interestingly, the preacher must have constant contact with his hearers; he must always speak directly to his audience--ad rem and ad hominem. He addresses neither students nor distant posterity. He tries to persuade those before him. He speaks to them as if conversing with them, keeping their attention alive and adapting his discourse to their understanding. Contact, therefore, is that quality in a speech which shows that it is a spoken composition, addressed to a definite audience, not a written essay addressed to anybody.¹⁵

Chrysostom never gives the impression in his homilies that he was reading a page of a book to his people. He achieves contact by direct address in the vocative, by imperatives, by questions, by the use of the first and second persons, and by all the forms of saying, thinking, and feeling

¹⁵ Francis Donnelly, Persuasive Speech (New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, c. 1931), p. 202.

which imply the presence of an audience. In an average homily, like the twentieth, some form of you, either expressed or contained in the verb, or your appears 165 times; of these forty-eight you or yours appear in quotations either real or by prosopopoeia; and 117 in the main text. The word we, direct or oblique case, appears fifty-three times, and our seventeen times. The pronoun I referring to Chrysostom in opposition to the audience appears twelve times. From these statistics it is at once apparent that Chrysostom's homilies have contact with the audience.

So direct is Chrysostom that he would sometimes ask his hearers point-blank whether they understood what he said, or whether he should continue the explanation. Once he threatened to question them individually:

I want to know whether everyone is listening to what is said, lest we cast the seed by the wayside. . . . How shall I find this out? When I think I see some among you who are not attentive I shall come and question them privately. If I find that they remember something--I do not say all--but something of what I have said I shall no longer suspect them. It would be better had I not forewarned you. . . but I can still take you by surprise for I have not said when I shall question you. Perhaps I shall do so today, perhaps tomorrow, perhaps only after twenty or thirty days.¹⁶

This contact with the audience makes the homily practical and objective. Chrysostom had not a speculative turn of mind, nor would speculation have appealed to his hearers, Greeks though they were. They were ordinary people faced with ordinary dangers of the world, aggravated by the particular corruptions of their time and place and by the prevalence of insidious and plausible heresies; and so Chrysostom's preaching was in the main immediately directed toward the strengthening of true faith and right living. It

¹⁶ Homily 4 on the Epistle to Hebrews. Migne, op. cit., v. 63, col.57. Writer's translation.

was to the personal life of the individual listener that he addressed himself and his moral discourses still have a remarkable atmosphere of actuality. But they are very outspoken. A good illustration of this last is had in Homily 88:

And mark you. We say that Christ has done great things, having made angels out of men; but, when we are called upon to give account, and required to prove this from our flock, our mouths will be sewed shut. For I am afraid, lest in place of angels, I bring forth swine as from a sty, and horses mad with lust. . . . I know you are pained, but not against all of you are these things spoken, but against the guilty, or rather not even against them if they wake up, but for them. Since now indeed all is lost and ruined, and the Church is become nothing better than a stable for oxen and a fold for asses and camels, and I go around looking for a sheep, and cannot see it. So much are all kicking, like horses, and any wild asses, and they fill the place here with much dung, for like this is their discourse. And indeed if one could see the things spoken at each assemblage, by men, and by women, you would see that their words are more unclean than any dung. . . . Wherefore I entreat you to change this evil custom, that the Church may smell of ointment. But now, while we lay up perfumes in it for the senses, we use no great diligence to purge out and drive away the uncleanness of the mind. What is the use, then? For we do not disgrace the Church so much by bringing dung into it, as we disgrace it by speaking such things to each other, about gains, about merchandise, about petty tradings, about things that are nothing to us, when there ought to be choirs of Angels here, and we ought to make the Church a heaven, and to know nothing else but earnest prayers, and silence with listening.¹⁷

A figure whose specific function is to achieve contact is the figure of communication. It invites the audience to deliberate with the speaker. It may be explicit or implicit. Chrysostom makes use of it rather often. Thus in one homily, the sixteenth, he makes use of expressions like the following:

Let us consider how great a wound is made by this word and unto how much evil it proceeds. . . .¹⁸

17 Homily 88, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1154

18 Homily 16, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 243

But that we may convict them in another way also, let us bring forward all their allegations. What then do they affirm? . . .19

And that this may be made yet clearer, let us hearken to the words of the Legislator. . . .20

What then shall we say in answer to this? . . .21

The same reckoning, then, I bid you make of His words, also when you hear Him speak of lowly things. . . .22

For let us suppose that this Law had been altogether done away. . . .23

But observe, I pray you, the increase of Grace. . . and observe here also how He commends the Old Law. . . .24

For tell me; were any one to gather together the wicked men from all quarters, and arm them with swords, and bid them massacre all who came in their way, could there be any thing more like a wild beast than he? . . . Now then, I bid you transfer these examples to the Law likewise; . . . Do you not see then how the commandments, so far from coming of cruelty, come rather of abounding mercy? . . . Tell me which sort of command is the more toilsome and grievous, "Do no murder," or "Be not angry"?25

Altogether he uses this figure of communication twenty-two times, in this single homily.

The third quality indispensable to interest is concreteness. Any exposition without it is like a house without windows, dark and cold,

19 Homily 16, Prevost, op. cit., p. 236

20 Ibid., p. 234

21 Ibid., p. 237

22 Ibid., p. 226

23 Ibid., P. 237

24 Ibid., p. 232

25 Ibid., p. 238

unattractive and comfortless. To achieve it the author must elaborate his main theme by the use of concrete matter: details, particulars, instances, examples, illustrations, stories, descriptions, comparison, contrasts and so on. All these help bring the discussion down from the clouds and into touch with actual experience, with objects such as the speaker's audience has seen and touched, with actions they have witnessed, or, better still, had part in. Newman says of Chrysostom:

. . . I speak of the kindly spirit and the genial temper with which he looks around at all things which this wonderful world contains, and of the promptitude and propriety with which he calls them up as arguments or illustrations in the course of his teaching as the occasion requires.

And Neilson elaborates:

The rich profusion of nature furnished this great teacher with images and metaphors as boundless and as varied as herself. To him no flowers that bloomed, no bird that gave out its morning or evening song, no insect of a day, no cloud that crossed the sky was meaningless. His eye detected secret sympathies and saw symbolic truths in all it rested on. He was truly a child of nature as he was a child of grace, and his mind was stored with spoils from every field he trod, from every scene he witnessed. The music of the spheres seemed to fall on his enchanted ear, and the mysteries of the universe opened to his enraptured eye; and so he was constantly telling men what they were quite familiar with, and yet had never seen till it was shown them. And this explains the freshness of his discourses and writings to this day; for it is true that after 1500 years there is nothing fresher yet, nothing finer for mankind to read.²⁷

In order that this vast field of concreteness may be covered concisely, concreteness has been resolved to two basic notions: the use of specific words, and the use of tropes. The longer tropes, viz., the analogy and comparison, can be considered an extended simile; the allegory and parable

26 Newman, op. cit., p. 286

27 Maloney, op. cit., intr., p. vii

as an extended metaphor. To impart the full impact of Chrysostom's graphic speech a single homily, the twentieth, will be considered. First, his use of specific, concrete words, and simple, picturesque tropes, then, the more extended figures. It would be possible to select a phrase from almost every line of any of the homilies, but a few phrases have been selected from

Homily 20:28

to sigh aloud and wail bitterly . . .
 wearing masks of those who fast . . .
 and cloaking themselves with excuses . . .
 they corrupt, they mar, they disfigure their faces . . .
 to fly from the pest . . .
 to hide in a closet . . .
 to lose the crown of fasting . . .
 to trod underfoot human glory . . .
 freed from the bondage of men . . .
 reap no little fruit in this world also . . .
 if you pursue virtue . . . with an eye to the ropemaker and the
 brazier . . . and the prostitute . . .
 the disease of vain glory . . .
 those herds of slaves, and that swarm of eunuchs, and their horses
 with trappings of gold, and their silver tables . . .
 tyranny of the passions . . .
 contempt of riches . . .
 drag to court . . .
 despise possessions . . .
 it is gently spoken . . . with unspeakable prudence . . .
 to lay up treasure in the midst of thieves . . .
 alarms them on a new ground . . .
 the moth and the rust will defraud . . .
 to restrain this mischief, check this harm . . .
 thieves make away . . . all have been despoiled . . .
 nailed to the things below . . .
 enslave the heart . . . and injure the mind . . .
 getting into harbor there . . .
 the mind enslaved and brought into captivity . . .
 to be bound on all sides, and to dwell in darkness, and to be full
 of turmoil . . .
 the plots, the strifes, the suits . . .
 to be imprisoned is not so grievous as for the mind to be enslaved
 by desire . . .
 understanding is a weapon and light . . .
 when our eyes are stricken out . . .

the perversion and maiming of the mind . . .
 tremble at poverty . . .
 for he who destroys the fountain, dries up the river . . .
 come even to the halter . . .
 wealth made them soft . . .
 to be insulted and despitefully used . . .
 torn themselves from life . . .
 waiting on wealth . . .
 venture on murders and stripes and revilings and shame and
 wretchedness . . .
 shameless, obstinate, effeminate . . .
 bondage, and affront, and loss, and continual vexation . . .
 convict you of making foolish excuses . . .
 palliation of superfluous labors . . .
 building splendid homes, planting trees, buying properties and
 inheritances . . .
 to be torpid . . .
 the end is at the doors . . .
 that fearful Day . . .
 the awful and incorruptible Tribunal . . .
 wars and earthquakes and famines . . . and universal destruction . . .
 in the midst of playing, eating, marrying . . .
 living in delight . . .
 consumed by lightnings . . .
 preparation for departure . . .
 the day of common consummation . . .29

Thirteen more elaborate figures appear in this same homily. We
 quote:

For the actor seems glorious just so long as the audience is sitting;
 but not even then in the sight of all. For most of the spectators know
 who it is, and what part he is playing. However, when the audience is
 broken up, he is more clearly discovered to all. Now this, you see, is
 what the vain-glorious must undergo. For even here they are manifest
 to the majority, that they are not what they appear to be, but that they
 wear a mask only; but much more will they be detected hereafter, when
 all things appear naked and open . . .30

The illustration taken from those who wrestle in the Olympic games
 has been quoted under clearness on page 68.

29 Homily 20, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, pp. 306-319 (passim).

30 Ibid., p. 308

This is to act as one insulting virtue itself, if you are to pursue it not for its own sake, but that the bad and they that are far removed from virtue may admire you . . . as if one were to choose to live continently, not for the excellence of continence, but that he might make a show before prostitutes. . . . You also, it would seem, would not choose virtue but for the sake of virtue's enemies; whereas, . . . you ought to admire her not for others, but for her own sake. Since we too, when loved not for our own, but for others' sake, account the thing an insult . . .³¹

Than this what could be more wretched? For in truth such a person will be worse off than any slave . . . giving up even the nobleness and liberty of man. For no matter how much anyone may talk to you, you will not be able to hear any of the things which concern you, while your mind is nailed down to money; but bound like a dog to a tomb, by the tyranny of riches, more grievously than by any chain, barking at all who come near you, you have this one employment continually, to keep for others what you have laid up. Than this what can be more wretched?³²

What the eye is to the body, the mind is to the soul. As therefore you would not choose to wear gold, and be clad in silken garments, your eyes being put out withal, but you account their sound health more desirable than all such superfluity, since when eyes are blinded, most of the energy of the other members is gone, their light being quenched, so also when the mind is depraved, your life will be filled with countless evils: as therefore in the body this is our aim, namely, to keep the eye sound, so also the mind in the soul. But if we mutilate this, which ought to give light to the rest, by what means are we to see clearly any more?³³

For when the pilot is drowned, and the candle is put out, and the general is taken prisoner; what sort of hope will there be, after that, for those who are under command?³⁴

For what is the use of soldiers arrayed in gold, when the general is dragged along a captive? What the profit of a ship beautifully equipped, when the pilot is sunk beneath the waves? What the advantage of a well-proportioned body, when the sight of the eyes is stricken out? As therefore should anyone cast into sickness the physician, (who should be in good health, that he may end our diseases) and then bid

³¹ Homily 20, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 309

³² Ibid., pp. 311-312

³³ Ibid., p. 313

³⁴ Ibid., p. 313

him lie on a silver couch, and in a chamber of gold, this will avail the sick persons nothing; even so, if you corrupt the mind (which has power to put down our passions) although you set it by a treasure, so far from doing it any good, you have inflicted the very greatest loss, and have harmed your whole soul.³⁵

And as they that are in darkness see nothing distinct, but if they look at a rope, they suppose it to be a serpent, if at mountains and ravines, they are dead with fear; so these also regard with suspicion what is not at all alarming to those who have sight.³⁶

For just as those who walk upon a stretched rope, making a display of so much courage, when some great emergency demands daring or courage, are not able, and dare not to think of such a thing, so they likewise who are rich, daring all for money, for self-restraint's sake dare not to submit to any thing, small or great. . . .³⁷

Yea, they undergo a two-fold darkness, both having their eyes put out by the perversion of their mind, and being involved in a great mist by the deceitfulness of their dares. . . . For he that is in darkness, is freed from the darkness by the mere appearance of the sun; but he that has his eyes mutilated not even when the sun shines; which is the very situation of these men: not even now that the Sun of Righteousness has shone out, do they perceive, their wealth having closed their eyes. And so they have a two-fold darkness to undergo, part from themselves, part from disregard to their Teacher.³⁸

For the love of money, like an evil humor which has collected upon a clear eyeball, has caused the cloud to become thick. But even this cloud may be easily scattered and broken, if we will but receive the beam of the doctrine of Christ . . .³⁹

Yet you, were any one among men on earth to show you a place beyond molestation, though he lead you out into the very desert, promising security in the keeping of your wealth,--you are not slow or backward; you have confidence in him, and put your goods there; but when it is

35 Homily 20, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 314

36 Ibid., p. 315

37 Ibid., p. 316

38 Loc. cit.

39 Loc. cit.

God instead of men who makes you this promise, and when He sets before you not the desert, but Heaven, you accept the contrary. . . .⁴⁰

What is yet more, you do not only bury your gold, but you plant it. For it is both treasure and seed; or rather it is more than either of these. For the seed remains not forever, but this abides perpetually. And again the treasure does not germinate, but this bears you fruits which never die.⁴¹

It must appear then from the sampling of concrete material above, that Chrysostom makes every effort to speak graphically.

The fourth and final means, to be considered, of securing interest is the stimulation of curiosity. For whatever stimulates the curiosity of the listener keeps him interested. Three obvious devices are used to secure this: the question, the fiction, and humor. Posing a question to the audience arouses a demand for an answer. We have treated this sufficiently in the chapter on clearness⁴² to make any extended treatment of it here superfluous. But stories are always interesting. Thus fables have been used by the wisest men with happy effect. Demosthenes prevented the Athenians from surrendering their orators to Philip by relating the fable about the sheep giving up their dogs to the wolves to obtain peace.⁴³

But a far nobler species of similitude is found in those admirable Parables which our Blessed Saviour used so copiously to instruct his followers, and in which, even to the present day, the wisdom of Heaven is distilled like gentle dew into the highest and lowest minds on earth.⁴⁴

40 Homily 20, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 317

41 Loc. cit.

42 Supra, p. 72

43 Coppens, op. cit., p. 73

44 Loc. cit.

Chrysostom, however, rarely tells stories or parables. He does so on occasion. Thus in Homily 9 he says:

And that what I may say may be clearer, let us conduct our argument by way of illustration.⁴⁵ As thus: suppose a certain servant who owes much money to his master, and then that this servant has been spiteful used by unjust men, and robbed of some of his goods. If then the master in whose power it was to stay the plunderer and wrong doer, should not indeed restore that same property, but should reckon what was taken away towards what was owed him by his servant, is the servant then injured? By no means. But what if he should repay him even more? has he not then even gained more than he has lost? Every one, I suppose, perceives it. Now this same reckoning we are to make in regard of our own sufferings. . . .⁴⁶

And again in Homily 65:

And in order that what I say may be more plain, let us work it on an illustration, and let us suppose there was some master of the games, the that many excellent combatants went down to this contest, and that some two of the combatants that were most nearly connected with the master of the games were to come to him and say, "Cause us to be crowned and proclaimed," confiding in their good-will and friendship with him; and that he were to say to them, "This is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared, by their labors, and their toils"; should we indeed condemn him as powerless? By no means, but we should approve him for his justice, and for having no respect of person. Then just as we should not say that he did not give the crown from want of vigor, but as not wishing to corrupt the law of the games, nor disturb the order of justice; in like manner now should I say Christ said this, from every motive to compel them, after the grace of God, to set their hopes of salvation and approval on the proof of their own good works.⁴⁷

Humor is that which gives mental pleasure by painless incongruity.⁴⁸

The power of ridicule is very great and with the exception of sacred orators

45 ἐπὶ ὑποδείγματος

46 Homily 9, Prevost, op. cit., p. 120

47 Homily 65, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 880

48 Donnelly, op. cit., p. 171

no leading speaker has disdained its force.⁴⁹ Hence, it is not surprising to find it rarely used in the homilies. There is an amusing passage in Homily 49, when Chrysostom speaks of fancy footgear. He says:

Ships are built, sailors and pilots engaged, sails spread and the sea crossed, wife and children and home left behind, barbarian lands traversed and the traders' life exposed to a thousand dangers--what for? So that you may trick out the leather of your boots with silk laces. What could be more mad? . . . For you that are so concerned about the beauty of threads and works of leather, do not look to heaven; and you who bending so to the earth, how can you admire the Beauty on high? Your chief concern as you walk through the public places is not to stain your boots with mud in the winter, and not cover them with dust when summer is come. Will you let your soul thus grovel while you are taking care of your boots? Boots are made to be dirtied: if you cannot bear this, take them off and wear them on your head. You laugh! --I am weeping at your folly.⁵⁰

Elegance.

The third quality a style must possess that it may please is a certain elegance. Not that it is to be complicated or involved or overladen with ornament; the style must remain simple, direct, easy to understand. But there should be a rhythm and carrying quality to the words and sentences. Elegance then depends in part on certain word figures which express the thought beautifully, and in part on certain figures of sound, where the effect is achieved by the choice and collocation of words.

The figures of sound which this thesis will consider in relation to Chrysostom are onomatopoeia, alliteration, parison, epanaphora, paronomasia, polyptoton, anastrophe, and antistrophe. The figures of thought which contribute to beauty are the antithesis, paradox, personification, synecdoche, and litotes.

⁴⁹ Donnelly, op. cit., p. 171

⁵⁰ Homily 49, Migne, op. cit., v. 58, cols. 502-503

Of the figures of sound the best known are onomatopoeia and alliteration. Through onomatopoeia the sound of the words resembles the sense. It is chiefly a poetic figure neither adapted to easy use in extempore speaking nor even appropriate in a homily. The same uselessness attaches itself to the figure of alliteration, where the same letter and sound begin successive words, as for example: ἀπλῶς ἅπαντα τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. It is purely accidental, and its only function seems to be to distract the mind by pleasing the ear.

Chief of the figures whose specific job is to add beauty to the discourse by creating music for the ear is the parison. It is a figure wherein two or more successive cola or sentences have the same general structure. It creates a feeling of order and symmetry. Monotony is avoided by inserting or omitting an extra word or by a chiasmic arrangement of words. Careful listening to Homily 23 will show how Chrysostom sings his way into the subject. There are sixty-eight examples of parison in this single homily. Of these some are perfect, some simple, others chiasmic, and twelve are combined with antithesis. The following are representative from Homily 23:⁵¹

Perfect Parison in short cola:

307, line 49:

ἅπαντα οἰκησεται καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις,
καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι,
καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις
all would be lost both in the churches, and in the cities
and in the homes

⁵¹ Homily 23, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, cols. 387-398. Where reference is made to Migne and not to translator, the translation is the writer's.

Col. 307, lines 50-53:

ἐὰν μὴ κρίνωσιν ὁ δεσπότης τὸν οἰκέτην,
καὶ ἡ δέσποινα τὴν θεραπαινίδα,
καὶ ὁ πατήρ τὸν υἱόν,
καὶ ὁ φίλος τὸν φίλον . . .

Unless they judge the master the servant, and the mistress
the maid, and the father the son, and a friend a friend . . .

Col. 312, line 67:

διακρίνειν τοὺς πονηροὺς καὶ τοὺς οὐ τοιούτους,
τοὺς κύνας καὶ τοὺς οὐ κύνας

to distinguish evil [men] and those not such, the dogs and
those not dogs

Parison in long cola:

Col. 310, 8-11:

καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ τις μᾶλλον οἶδεν, ἢ τὰ ἐτέρων,
καὶ τὰ μείζονα μᾶλλον ὁρᾷ, ἢ τὰ ἐλάττω,
καὶ ἑαυτὸν μᾶλλον φιλεῖ, ἢ τὸν πλησίον . . .

for each knows his own things better than those of others,
and sees the larger things better than the smaller ones,
and loves himself better than [his] neighbor . . .

Col. 314, 49-53:

Εἰ γὰρ τὰ κύματα καὶ τὰ πελάγη τοῖς ναύταις,
καὶ αἱ σφαγαὶ καὶ τὰ τραύματα τοῖς στρατιώταις,
καὶ οἱ χειμῶνες καὶ οἱ κρυμοὶ τοῖς γεωργοῖς,
καὶ τοῖς πυκτενύουσιν αἱ δριμεῖαι πληγαὶ
κοῦφα καὶ φορητὰ πάντα . . .

For if to the sailors the waves and the seas,
and to the soldiers the slaughters and the wounds,
and to the farmers the winters and the frosts,
and to the boxers the sharp blows,
all [be] light and tolerable things . . .

Imperfect Parison in long cola:

Col. 309, 36-41:

κἂν ἴδωσι

μοναχὸν περιττὸν ἱμάτιον ἔχοντα

τὸν νόμον αὐτῷ προβάλλονται τὸν δεσποτικόν,

αὐτοὶ μυριά ἄρπαζοντες καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην πλεονεκτοῦντες τὴν ἡμέραν

κἂν ἴδωσι

δαψιλεστέρας τροφῆς ἀπολαύοντα,

πικροὶ γίνονται κατήγοροί,

καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτοὶ μεθύοντες καὶ κραιπαλῶντες . . .

But if they see a monk wearing an unnecessary garment

they throw up to him the law of the Lord,

while they themselves are extorting endlessly and defrauding

every day;

and if they see [him] enjoying a more plentiful nourishment

they become bitter accusers,

while they themselves are getting drunk and are surfeiting

every day.

Chiastic Parison, i.e., the order of the words is inverted for variety:

Col. 307, 54:

τὰ φάρμακα τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ τοὺς τῆς εἰρήνης λόγους

the medicines of salvation and the words of peace

Col. 313, 11-12:

. . . μὴ ἀποστῆς, ἕως ἂν λάβῃς·

ἕως ἂν εὔρῃς, μὴ ἀναχωρήσῃς·

μὴ καταλύσῃς τὴν σπουδὴν, ἕως ἂν ἀνοίχθῃ ἡ θύρα.

. . . withdraw not, until you receive;

until you find, retire not;

relax not your diligence, until the door be opened.

Parison combined with Antithesis:

Col. 309, lines 12-15:

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὀνειδίζειν δεῖ,
 οὐδὲ ἐπεμβαίνειν, ἀλλὰ νουθετεῖν·
 οὐ κακηγορεῖν, ἀλλὰ συμβουλευεῖν·
 οὐδὲ μετὰ ἀπονοιάς ἐπετιθέσθαι, ἀλλὰ μετὰ φιλοστοργίας διορθ
 For we ought not to upbraid,
 nor to inveigh, but to admonish;
 not to revile, but to advise;
 nor to assail with pride, but to correct with tenderness.

Col. 320, 44-46:

Τί τοίνυν βέλτιον, εἰπέ μοι;
 πλουτεῖν, ἢ πένεσθαι;
 ἐν δυναστείᾳ εἶναι, ἢ ἐν ἀτιμιά;
 ἐν τρυφῇ, ἢ ἐν λιμῷ;

Which then is better, tell me?
 to be rich, or to be poor?
 to be in power, or to be in dishonor?
 in luxury, or in hunger?

Chiastic Parison with Antithesis:

Col. 309, lines 27-29:

Διορθώσου μὲν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ὡς πολέμιος.
 μηδὲ ὡς ἐχθρὸς ἀπαιτῶν δίκην,
 ἀλλ' ὡς ἰατρὸς φάρμακα κατασκευάζων.

Correct [him] then, but not as a foe
 nor as an enemy exacting a penalty,
 but as a physician providing medicines

Imperfect Parison with Antithesis:

Col. 312, 43-45:

Ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν γὰρ, ἂν συνεχῶς τοῦτο ποιῇς,
 καὶ ὀχληρὸς καὶ Βαρὺς εἶναι δοκεῖς·
 ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅταν μὴ τοῦτο ποιῇς,
 τότε παροξύνεις μειζρόνως.

For among men, if you would continually do this,
 you would seem to be both troublesome and disgusting;
 but with God, if you do not do this,
 then you more greatly provoke [Him].

There is a beautiful passage wherein nearly all the types of parison may be found when Chrysostom compares us playing at life and children living their games;⁵² and again in the passage describing the man amassing wealth for himself and the man spending it for others;⁵³ and still a third comparing the proud and the humble man.⁵⁴

Sometimes connected with the parison is the figure epanaphora. There is no doubt that this figure adds a great amount of artistic beauty to the presentation. But because the passage achieves an intense and passionate feeling it has been reserved for consideration under the quality of vigor.

The remaining figures of sound will be treated summarily, a few examples being pointed out of each. Paronomasia means using words connected with the same root and having a similar sound but dissimilar meaning:

Col. 312, line 34:

εἰδὼς ὅτι οὐ πάντως εὐρήσεις, πάντα κινεῖς ἐρεῦνης
 τρόπον

Knowing that you will not find it at all, yet you institute every kind of search

52 Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 319, ll. 1-30

53 Ibid., col. 319, ll. 37-57

54 Ibid., col. 320, lines 11-27

Col. 315, 22-23:

ὁ γὰρ ἀγωνιζόμενος, ἐπειδὴν ἴδῃ σαφῶς
τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην θαυμάζοντα τὸ ἐπιίπουν
τῶν ἀγωνισμάτων προθυμότερος γίνεται.

For the one who is in the contest, when he actually sees
the judge of the lists marvelling at the painfulness of
his efforts, is the more inspired.⁵⁵

Antistrophe--the repetition of one or more words at the end of successive
cola--is exemplified in the following lines:

Col. 318, 55-56:

τί γὰρ παιδῶν, εἰπέ μοι, διεστήκαμεν τῶν παιγούτων
καὶ οἰκίας οἰκοδομοῦντων, ἡμεῖς οἱ τὰς λαμπρὰς
οἰκίας οἰκοδομοῦντες;

For how, tell me, do we differ from children playing at
building houses, we who build our splendid homes?

Col. 311, 20-21:

Οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ οὐκ οἶδε, μηδὲ δράτῳ ἵνα μὴ καταπατήσῃ
ᾧ οὐκ οἶδεν.

Therefore since he knows not, neither let him not see [it],
lest he trample underfoot what he knows not.

Col. 318, lines 50-53:

οὐκ ἔστι παίγνιον ὁ βίος· μᾶλλον δὲ ὁ μὲν παρὼν
βίος παίγνιον. Τὰ δὲ μέλλοντα οὐ παίγνια. Τάχα δὲ
οὐδὲ παίγνιον ὁ βίος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτου χειρόν.

Life is not a plaything: or rather our present life is a
plaything. But the things to come are not playthings.
But perhaps neither is this life only a plaything, but
even worse than this.

55 Cf. also infra, Antistrophe: παιδῶν . . . παίζόντων

Anastrophe repeats the final word of one clause at the beginning of the next

For instance:

Col. 318, 37-40:

Εἰ γὰρ ἄνθρωπὸν τις εὐεργέτην λιμώττοντα ἰδὼν, οὐχ ἂν
περιϊῖδοι· εἰ δὲ καὶ περιϊῖδοι, ὄνειδιζόμενος ἔλοιτο
μᾶλλον καταδῦναι εἰς τὴν γῆν . . .

For if anyone seeing but a man, his benefactor, hungering,
would not neglect [him]; or if he should neglect him,
being reproached [for it] would choose rather to sink
into the earth . . .

Col. 309, 4-5:

ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐνταῦθα ἠνίξαστο· καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς
ἠνίξαστο, ἀλλὰ . . .

This then is the sort of thing which Christ also in this
place intimated; not only intimated, but . . .

Polyptoton is akin to the figure paronomasia. It consists in repeating the
same word in close succession in two different cases. All the homilies end
with this figure:

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

per saecula saeculorum. Amen.

But cf. also supra, page 97 -- ὁ φίλος τὸν φίλον.

More important than the figures of sound are the figures of thought.

Here must be listed again the parison, for it is not simply a figure of
sound. It indicates balanced and parallded thought behind the sentence
structure. This symmetry of thought creates a poetical effect. As when
Chrysostom says:

Col. 283, lines 52-53:

μητε δι' ἀνθρώπους ὑπακούε τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν Θεὸν ἀνθρώποις

Not for men's sake to obey God; but men for God's sake

Col. 312, line 58:

οὐκ αἰτεῖν χρὴ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἃ χρὴ αἰτεῖν

we ought not only to ask, but also ask what we ought

Col. 289, 22-23:

τοῦ γὰρ μάχεσθαι ἔχοντα βέλτιον τὸ μὴ ἔχοντα ἀπηλαχθαι μάχης

to lack and be free from strife is better than to possess and strive

Col. 289, 44-45:

τοῦ ἐνταῦθα θησαυροῦ τὴν βλάβην, καὶ τοῦ ἐκεῖ τὴν ὠφέλειαν

the hurt of treasure here and the profit of what is there

Parison is especially effective when combined with antithesis; in addition to those quoted on the preceding pages:

Col. 310, 32-35:

Σὺ δὲ τὴν μὲν σουτοῦ δοκὸν οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐκβάλλεις,

ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὁρᾷς·

τὸ δὲ ἐτέρου κάρφος οὐ μόνον ὁρᾷς

ἀλλὰ καὶ κρίνεις.

You however do not only not cast out your own beam,
but do not even see [it];
yet another's mote not only do you see
but even judge.

Col. 315, 17-20:

ὅτι τραχεῖα καὶ στενὴ,

ἀλλὰ ποῦ τελευτᾷ·

μηδ' ὅτι πλατεῖα καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἡ ἐναντιᾷ,

ἀλλὰ ποῦ καταστρέφει.

[Take heed not] that it is rough and narrow,
but where it ends;
nor that the opposite is wide and spacious,
but where it issues.

Col. 315, 27-28:

μή ταῖς τῶν πολλῶν εὐημερίαις προσέχειν,
ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῶν ὀλίγων πόνοις

not to regard the felicities of the many,
but the labors of the few.

Closely connected with the figure of antithesis is that of paradox. Paradoxical statements abound in the homilies. The following are representative samples; the Greek text is omitted where the figures do not depend on choice or position of words:

Men's joy has sorrow in it; just as goodly tears joy.⁵⁶

Christ blesses those who mourn, and pronounced those who
laugh wretched.⁵⁷

In the advantage of our neighbor stands our own advantage.⁵⁸

If you give, it remains; if you give not, it perishes.⁵⁹

Then the houses were Churches, but now the Church is become
a house.⁶⁰

The enduring soul is borne up by the very things which hinder it.⁶¹

Neither therefore are they angels, because they do not marry;
but because they are angels, therefore they do not marry.⁶²

56 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 87

57 Ibid., p. 87

58 Homily 16, *ibid.*, p. 248

59 Homily 20, *ibid.*, p. 311

60 Homily 32, *ibid.*, v. 2, p. 475

61 Homily 66, *ibid.*, v. 3, p. 889

62 Homily 70, ibid., v. 3, p. 945

For the travelled way is more desert than any desert.⁶³

Such a table had that rich man, therefore not even of a drop of water was he master.⁶⁴

And the clothing is more miserable than the nakedness.⁶⁵

It is not possible for him to be rich, who is not wealthy in his soul; like it is not possible for him to be poor, who has not the poverty in his mind. . . . This is a sure proof of being rich, to despise wealth, and to want nothing; and of poverty again, to want. . . . It is quite evident that to be in poverty rather makes one to be rich. . . . If then the desiring more be a mark of poverty, he that is in possession of riches, since he is like this, is most in poverty. . . . Do you see then that soul is especially poor, when it is rich; and then is rich, when it is poverty?⁶⁶

The remaining figures appear only here and there:

Personification:

Had attracted to Him the land of the Persians⁶⁷

You see nature herself put to shame⁶⁸

Synecdoche:

You disgrace your eyes⁶⁹

They purchased His Blood⁷⁰

Litotes:

Counted it not unworthy⁷¹

For neither is this a little matter to able to find⁷²

Your danger is not small⁷³

63 Homily 81, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1077

64 Homily 70, ibid., p. 949

65 Homily 81, ibid., p. 1076

66 Homily 80, ibid., pp. 1067-1068

67 Homily 6, ibid., p. 85

68 Ibid., p. 91

69 Loc. cit.

70 Homily 90, ibid., v. 3, p. 1168

71 Homily 6, ibid., p. 82

72 Homily 1, ibid., p. 13

73 Homily 11, ibid., p. 159

This chapter then has concerned itself with the means of pleasing the hearer: with variety, interest, and beauty or elegance. But the important over-all, dominant virtue regulating the ut placeat of the homily is propriety or appropriateness. Thonssen says it is "the most functional aspect of the whole problem of style," and calls it "a tool of adaptive behavior used by the orator to adjust himself to his audience situation."⁷⁴ The style, then, must be appropriate to the orator, to the audience, to the subject.

It should be consistent with the speaker himself. It should help to reveal the character of the speaker; it must not clash with his personality. And the style of the homilies is just that. If Socrates and Sozomen are correct in their character estimate of Chrysostom then the style of Chrysostom is the man Chrysostom. For Socrates says:

He was a man who in his zeal for virtue was over-bitter, and . . . given to wrath rather than to modest dealings; from the uprightness of his life he made no provision for the future, and from his simplicity of character acted openly and quickly. He used unmeasured freedom of speech with those whom he encountered, and as a teacher greatly benefited his hearers; but he was considered by those who did know his ways to be arrogant in his behavior.⁷⁵

And his style is similar: lucid in order, clear in exposition, logical in argument, fervid in exhortation, touching in appeal, indignant in denunciation. Stephens says:

. . . The mixture of plain common sense, simple boldness, and tender affection, with which he would strike home to the hearts and consciences of his hearers--all these are not only general characteristics of the

⁷⁴ Thonssen, and Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Co., c. 1948), p. 415.

⁷⁵ Socrates, op. cit., VI, 3 (Migne, op. cit., v. 67, col. 670).

man, but are usually found manifested more or less in the compass of each discourse. It is this rare union of powers which constitutes his superiority to almost all other Christian preachers with whom he might be, or has been, compared. Savonarola had all, and more than all, his fire and vehemence, but untempered by his sober, calm good sense, and wanting his rational method of interpretation. Chrysostom was eager and impetuous at times in speech as well as in action, but never fanatical. . . .⁷⁶

Up to this point propriety has been discussed in relation to the speaker. But the concept of appropriateness goes further. The style must be appropriate to the audience addressed. While he himself is full of denunciations of contemporary rhetoric and particularly that of his old teacher, Libanius, yet at the same time he grants that a certain amount of rhetorical artifice is justifiable in a sermon owing to the weakness of the audience.⁷⁷ He knew how to let himself gracefully down to the capacity of an uncultivated audience, and to speak with perspicuity, simplicity, and naturalness which fully explain why not only the higher classes but the middle and lower heard him preach with delight and admiration.⁷⁸ He strove with the greatest earnestness to avoid obscurity of language. He always chose the most familiar words, and did not hesitate to use the phrases of common life. Yet perhaps to us today Chrysostom's style may appear far too exuberant. But quite apart from the fact that closer examination shows that he was not so wasteful of words as appears at first sight, and that he could be tellingly terse, these are not the standards by which to judge him. He was a Greek, talking to Greeks, and to orientals at Antioch and Constan-

⁷⁶ Stephens, op. cit., p. 426

⁷⁷ H. M. Hubbell, Chrysostom and Rhetoric (Classical Philology, University of Chicago Press, 1929, vol. 19) p. 276.

⁷⁸ Perthes, op. cit., p. 234

tinople in the fourth century. His congregation was a difficult one at best--heterogeneous, emotional, wayward, unstable and frivolous. The whole temper of the congregation at this time is aptly expressed by Gregory of Nazianzen as he bids farewell to the ungrateful capitol: "It is orators they want, not priests."⁷⁹

Finally the style of speech must be appropriate to its own content. The speaker must accommodate himself to the purpose in view, and his style changes with the accommodations. Cicero says: "The universal rule, in oratory as in life, is to consider propriety. This depends on the subject under discussion. . . ."⁸⁰ And Quintilian insists the style be adapted not only to the cause, but to the particular parts of the cause.⁸¹ Thus Chrysostom's language while expounding the Scripture is thoughtful and temperate; but when he speaks against vices or sins, against Jews or heretics it rises to vehemence. No one can employ words more touching, impassioned, vigorous, or penetrating than Chrysostom. Hence he delays no longer than necessary for the general understanding of his text. He then proceeds directly to make use of his explanation for impressing the mind and heart of his audience. To accomplish this single, ultimate object, he exerts the entire strength of his intellect, exhausts the whole power of his invention and

⁷⁹ Gregory of Nazianzen, Orat. XLII (Migne, col. 488B) quoted in H. M. Hubbell, op. cit., p. 263.

⁸⁰ Cicero, Orator, XXI, 71. Translated by H. M. Hubbell, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942) p. 359.

⁸¹ Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, XII, 10, 69-72. Translated by H. E. Butler, vol. IV, pp. 487, 489.

unfolds the full compass of his abundant knowledge. And when his thoughts elevate to contemplation of divine things so does his style in sublime and glorious flight. Yet, he was far from maintaining throughout a whole address this lofty strain. It is a clear proof of his knowledge of the art of speaking that a great variety of style characterized his sermons. The tender and the vigorous, the serious and the lively, the lofty and the familiar, entreaty and reproof, warning and consolation, were so skillfully intermingled that the hearts of his hearers were assailed on all sides, and every faculty of the soul visited by an appeal. And this brings the thesis to the consideration of the next chapter on the appeal he makes to the passions, ut veritas moveat.

CHAPTER V

UT MOVEAT

Regardless of how clear the homily has been, or how beautiful, it still has to pass by far the most difficult test: Is it effective? Does it result in action? Does it move? In this chapter, the longest and the most important, the field, wherein the orator proves himself properly an orator, is to be surveyed. Cicero says:

Quis enim non fateatur, cum ex omnibus oratoris laudibus longe ista sit maxima, inflammare animos audientium et quocumque res postulet modo flectere, qui hac virtute caruerit, id ei quod maximum fuerit defuisse?¹

For, he says, "Probare necessitatis est, delectare suavitatis, flectere victoriae."²

And what Cicero said is still true today for human nature does not change. Persuasion is as necessary, and its elements are the same, today, as in the time of Demosthenes and Cicero. And they are equally necessary in the field of sacred as well as profane oratory. Doctrinal and historical instruction and sermons, appealing to the intellect, make for few moral

¹ Cicero, Brutus, 80 (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942) pp. 240-242. "Since among all the attributes of eloquence, the greatest by far is the power of fixing minds of the auditors and of bending them in whatever direction the case demands, who will not grant that the speaker who is destitute of this power is wanting in the most important element of success?" Translation is the writer's.

² Cicero, Orator XXI, 69. Translated by H. M. Hubbell, op. cit., p. 357: "To prove is the first necessity, to please is charm, to sway is victory."

conversions. Moral sermons touching the heart are more effective. The object of preaching is to make men better, and, incidentally only, wiser. The preacher must, then, in the time at his disposal, propose definite action to his hearers and induce them to take it. But resolve is not formed without the inducement of motives or reasons for acting, good as well as true. He must point out to the will the good inherent in the conduct urged. The will is bent by the promise of happiness, real or imagined, near or distant, temporal or eternal.

The truth, then, must be explained and understood, and, if need be, proved and objections answered. It must be presented beautifully, attractively, and clearly. But conviction does not suffice. It gives light without heat. Many know the truth, but do it not. Romans 7, 19 agrees with the pagan Ovid: "Video meliora proboque, Deteriora sequor."³ Newman tells us we may as well try to sharpen razors on granite rocks or moor with silk threads huge vessels, as to subdue with knowledge passion and pride.⁴ Thus lest pride, prejudice or sinful ambition still thwart him, the preacher must make passion side with reason, so that both may urge their suit upon the will.

Persuasion, therefore, demands emotion. For we are more heart than head, and our hearts need to be filled with exalted feeling, generosity, enthusiasm, joy, devotion and religious sensibility. Campbell puts it forcefully:

³ Ovid, Metamorphoses, 7, 21: "I see the right and I approve it, too; the wrong condemn and yet the wrong pursue."

⁴ Newman, quoted in Sharp, op. cit., p. 121.

To say that it is possible to persuade men without speaking to the passions is but at best a specious kind of nonsense. The coolest reasoner always in persuading addresseth himself to the passions in some way or other . . . To make me believe it is enough to show me that things are so: to make me act it is necessary to show that the action will answer some end. That can never be an end to me which gratifies no passion or affection in my nature. You assure me "it is for my honor." Now you solicit my pride, without which I had never been able to understand the word. You say, "It is for my interest." Now you bespeak my self-love. "It is for the public good." Now you rouse my patriotism. "It will relieve the miserable." Now you touch my pity. So far, therefore, is it from being an unfair method of persuasion to move the passions that there is no persuasion without moving them.

But if so much depends on passion, where is the scope for argument? Before I answer that question, let it be observed that in order to persuade there are two things that must be carefully studied by the orator. The first is to excite some desire or passion in the hearers: the second is to satisfy their judgment that there is a connection between the action to which he would persuade them and the gratification of the desire or passion which he excites. This is the analysis of persuasion. The former is effected by communicating lively and glowing ideas of the object: the latter, unless so evident of itself as to supersede the necessity, by presenting the best and most forcible arguments which the nature of the subject admits. In the one lies the pathetic, in the other the argumentative. These incorporated together constitute that vehemence of contention to which the greatest exploits of eloquence ought doubtless to be ascribed.⁵

In this chapter, therefore, there is to be considered the emotional appeal that Chrysostom makes to inspire his hearers to act the truth he was preaching. First: the passions to which appeal can be made; then those particular qualities of style which facilitate this appeal. These last qualities have been reduced to three: Emphasis or Force, Vigor or Energy, and Progress or Movement.

The passions, according to Aristotle are "all those affections which cause men to change their opinion in regard to their judgments, and are

⁵ Campbell, Philosophy of Rhetoric, (quoted by Bull, Preaching and Sermon Construction, Macmillan, 1922, p. 212) Bk. 1, Chapter 3.

accompanied by pleasure and pain."⁶ The pleasure and pain of which Aristotle speaks as consequent upon these emotions arise from the apprehension of Good and Evil; for a man tends instinctively to what his imagination presents to him as good, and he shrinks from what it presents as evil. Hence, there are six basic passions: Love or Hatred from the apprehension of Good or Evil; Desire or Aversion from the apprehension of future good or evil; and Joy or Sadness from present good or evil. The difficulty of attaining the apprehended good or of avoiding the evil gives rise to a second set of passions: hope, if the good is attainable; despair, if the good is unattainable; fear, if the evil is difficult to avoid; courage, if avoidable; anger, if evil is present. Aristotle devotes the first seventeen chapters of his second book on rhetoric to a thorough and most ingenious examination of various passions, considering in what classes of persons and under what circumstances they are apt to arise and by what process they may be enkindled. The passions with which the orator is chiefly concerned are enumerated by Cicero as follows: love, hate, wrath, jealousy, compassion, hope, joy, fear, and vexation.⁷

⁶ Aristotle, Rhetoric, Bk. II, I, 8: "Ἔστι δὲ τὰ παῖθη, δι' ὅσα μεταβάλλοντες διαφέρουσι πρὸς τὰς κρίσεις, οἷς ἐπεται λύπη καὶ ἡδονή. Translation from Freeze, op. cit., p. 173.

⁷ Cicero, De Oratore, II, 51. "Amor, odium, iracundia, invidia, misericordia, spes, laetitia, timor, molestia." Translation by Sutton, op. cit., (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942) p. 349. And in II, 42 he says:

Nihil est in dicendo. . . majus, quam ut faveat oratori is, qui audiet, utque ipse sic moveatur ut impetu quodam animi et perturbatione, magis quam iudicio aut consilio regatur. Plura enim multo homines judicant odio aut amore aut cupiditate aut iracundia aut dolore aut laetitia aut spe aut timore aut errore aut aliqua permotione mentis, quam veritate

These then are the passions or feelings to which appeal can be made. The following passage from Homily 32, where Chrysostom begs for their love and consideration, will serve as an example of a Christian appeal to moderate passions:

Yea, and I for one would rather enter into any of your houses ten thousand times, and be baffled, than not be heard when I speak here. This latter is harder for me to bear than the other, by how much This House is of greater dignity; our great possessions being verily laid up here, here all the hopes we have. . . . Wherefore here at least receive us with love when we come to you. And when I say, "Peace be to you," and you say, "And with your spirit," say it not with the mouth and voice only, but also with your mind and heart. For if, you say, "Peace" here, and out of doors you are my enemy, spitting at and calumniating me, and secretly aspersing me with innumerable reproaches, what kind of peace is this? Yet, though you speak evil of me ten thousand times, I give you that peace with a pure heart, with sincerity of purpose, and I can say nothing evil at any time about you; for I have a father's bowels. And if I rebuke you at any time, I only do it out of concern for you. But you, in return, by your secret carping at me and by not receiving me in the Lord's house, add to my despondency; not for your insulting me, not for your casting me out, but for your rejecting our peace, and drawing down upon yourself that grieving punishment.

For I shake not off the dust, I turn not away, and will not cease from continually speaking peace to you; and if, besides your insults, you receive me not, even then I shake not off the dust; not that I am disobedient to our Lord, but that I vehemently burn for you. And besides, I have suffered nothing at all for you; I have neither come a

aut praescripto aut juris norma aliqua aut iudicii formula aut legibus. Sutton, *op. cit.*, p. 325:

Now nothing in oratory. . . is more important than to win for the orator the favour of his hearer, and to have the latter so affected as to be swayed by something resembling a mental impulse or emotion, rather than by judgement [sic] or deliberation. For men decide far more problems by hate, or love, or lust, or rage, or sorrow, or joy, or hope, or fear, or illusion, or some other inward emotion, than by reality, or authority, or any legal standard, or judicial precedent, or statute.

long journey, not with that garb and that voluntary poverty am I come, (therefore we first blame ourselves,) nor without shoes and a second coat; and perhaps this is why you also fail on your part. However, while our condemnation is greater, to you it imparts no excuse. . . . and this is why I lament, and will not cease lamenting. For I have no power to quit this house, but here we must needs remain until we depart from this present life. Receive us, therefore, as Paul commanded. . . . This is what we ask of you: love, and that fervent and genuine affection. But if you cannot give us this love, at least love yourselves, and lay aside your present remissness. And it will be sufficient for our consolation, if we see you becoming better men. And I myself will also show forth increased love, even though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved.

Surely there are many things to bind us together. One Table is set before all, one Father begat us, we are all the issue of the same throe, the same drink has been given to all; or rather not only the same drink, but also to drink out of the same cup, a thing which belongs to intense love. But "there is no comparison between the Apostles and us." I confess it too, and would never deny it. For I say, not to them but not even to their shadows, are we comparable. But nevertheless, do your part; it will not disgrace you. For if even to unworthy persons you show so much love and obedience, then shall you receive the greater reward. For the words which we speak, are not our own, but what we have received, that we also give; and in giving we seek for nothing else from you, but to be loved only. And if we be unworthy even of this, yet by our loving you we shall quickly become worthy. We are commanded to love not them only who love us, but even our enemies. Who then is so hardhearted, who so savage, that after having received such a law, he should abhor and hate even those who love him, full as he may be of innumerable evils?⁸

Emphasis.

Since the emotions still demand something more than the "tame and bloodless phraseology" of the philosophers, in order to make an effective appeal to them and thus affect the will of his hearers, the orator must endow his style with the following three qualities: Emphasis, vigor, and movement. Now we take up the first of these.

Emphasis insists that the more important parts of the subject be made

⁸ Homily 32, Prevost, op. cit., vol. 27, pp. 473-475

especially memorable to the hearer. The problem, then, for the orator is to make the important things stand out. There are several ways of doing this. One is emphasis by position, i.e., by placing the main ideas where they will be high-lighted. These positions are the beginning, where what is said finds the mind alert, and the end, where what is last said is most likely to remain in the mind of the hearer. This is automatically achieved in the homily. Chrysostom wastes no time in making long introductions. As we pointed out in the section on unity, he jumps at once in medias res. For example in Homily 72 the text under discussion is: "Then spake Jesus to the multitudes" The first words Chrysostom says are "'Then'--when?" As for the ending in the homily it is always the moral exhortation, which is usually the most important thing the preacher has to say.

But Chrysostom uses other means of achieving emphasis. He achieves it by proportion. For what is kept long before the attention will naturally wear deeper into the consciousness. This is done by repetition, in various forms, of the main idea in one place, or here and there throughout the speech--by explaining it, by going more and more into detail with it, by illustrating it, by proving its truth, by comparing it with similar or contrasting ideas.

Chrysostom does this in Homily 34, where he explains the text about Christ's mission of His disciples. Chrysostom points out how Christ exhorted the Apostles to preach fearlessly--not to fear those who kill the body but can not kill the soul, but rather to fear Him Who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell. He takes it to mean that not death but God is

to be feared. In fact, for this very cause, because they feared death, they should preach fearlessly because this will deliver them from that which is really death. The next lines develop the paradoxical idea that "deliverance from death is not near so great as persuading men to despise it." And furthermore, did not men have a providential Father Who cares even for the sparrows? And if He sends men death, are they to fear it? And is not death the first step in receiving their reward?

Chrysostom rephrases the original text at length, that Christ exhorts His Apostles to preach fearlessly, not to fear men who can only cause death of the body, but ~~to~~ God Who can crucify the soul eternally. Now comes the application to us. We too must confess God fearlessly. And for the same reasons. There is glory in the conflict and glory in the reward. "Why, if in the season of the conflicts they that confess are so glorious, imagine what they will be in the season of the crowns?" This latter idea is amplified in description of the Last Judgment.

Next he introduces the objection that perhaps the decay of the body is what makes us fear death. But no, he answers, it should not; corruption of the body does not mean destruction, but refashioning of it for the resurrection--like recasting a statue. And again he objects that the resurrection of the body would take place without this decay. Then he gives seven reasons why it is providential that the body does decay. The thought of it even tempers man's love for the physical beauty of a woman. "Wherefore the body decays presently, that you might see unveiled the beauty of the soul. For if she be the procurer of all that beauty and life, much more excellent

must she herself be."⁹ He concludes the sermon with a eulogy on the soul. And thus over and over Chrysostom hammers in one thought that death is not to be feared, because the soul is more important than the body.

Chrysostom, repeatedly, throughout his homilies, emphasizes a point by stating directly its value or relative value. For instance he would say: "And what is yet greater. . . ." "For in truth it was a very great thing. . . ." "And mark. I shall say something now even more fearful. . . ."

There are also special figures of redundancy and repetition to which attention may be called here because they add in some measure to emphasis. Pleonasm consists in the synonymous repetition of the same or at least a similar idea. Whether or not this figure makes for good writing it undoubtedly makes for good speaking. Chrysostom uses it profusely. Besides the usual "I beg and beseech," "fear and tremble," "in vain and to no purpose," "great and excellent"--we find a host of others more elaborate. We mention just two; in Homily 6 it is joined with epanaphora:

For I seek those tears which are shed not for display, but in compunction; those which trickle down secretly and in closets, and in the sight of no man, softly and noiselessly; those which arise from a certain depth of mind, those shed in anguish and sorrow, those which are shed for God alone.¹⁰

And in Homily 20 it appears with parison, polyptoton, and epanaphora:

For what sort of desire is this, to be in grievous bondage, and to be subject to a tyranny, and to be bound on all sides, and to dwell in darkness, and to be full of turmoil, and to endure toils without profit, and to keep thy wealth for others, and often for thy very enemies? with

9 Homily 34, Prevost, op. cit., v. 2, p. 504

10 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., p. 87

what sort of desire do these things agree? or rather of what flight and aversion are they not worthy? What sort of desire, to lay up treasure in midst of thieves?¹¹

Another form of redundancy through which emphasis is obtained is the arsis and thesis, which states the idea once negatively and then restates it positively. This figure has been treated under clearness.¹²

Anadiplosis is the last figure of repetition which we mention here under emphasis. It consists in the repetition of the same word within the same clause, either immediately or after a short interval. Although a very simple figure it makes not only for emphasis but great intensity:

This is not, this is not so.¹³

Οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔστι.¹⁴

For terrible, terrible is the monster . . .¹⁵

Δεινὸν γὰρ, [sic] δεινὸν τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ θηρίον..¹⁶

For I know, yea, I know many . . .¹⁷

Οἶδα γὰρ, οἶδα πολλοὺς, [sic]¹⁸

Combined with antistrophe:

Τί ὀδυρόη, παιδίον; παιδίον γὰρ δεῖ τὸν τοιοῦτον καλεῖν.¹⁹

Why do you lament, you little child; for such a one we have to call a little child.²⁰

11 Homily 20, Prevost, op. cit., p. 316

12 Supra, p. 73

13 Homily 11, Prevost, op. cit., p. 149

14 Homily 11, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 194, p.m.

15 Homily 80, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1064

16 Homily 80, Migne, op. cit., v. 58, col. 728

17 Homily 20, Prevost, op. cit., p. 306

18 Homily 20, Migne, op. cit., v. 57, col. 286

19 Homily 80, Migne, op. cit., v. 58, col. 729, a.m.

20 Homily 80, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1067

Finally emphasis can be secured by heightened style. And this brings us to a second quality, which we have called Vigor.

Vigor

Vigor or energy is related to emphasis; it gives an impression of strength. It creates sharply defined pictures and uses apt word arrangements and apt substantives, not colorless words or phrases. This last aspect of vigor we have treated under concreteness.²¹ It requires an energetic nature and frame of mind. It produces vigorous thinking, passionate feeling and determined purpose to say this important thing as impressively as it deserves. It finds for the orator thoughts that startle and words that burn. It achieves forceful expression through the tableau and related figures, through exaggeration, and through the figures of direct pathos.

As the passions arise from what appears good or evil, the orator must present that good or evil strikingly to the minds of his hearers, and thus arouse the proposed passions. Blair says:

To every emotion or passion nature has adapted a set of corresponding objects, and without setting these before the mind it is not in the power of any orator to rouse that emotion. I am warmed with gratitude. I am touched with compassion, not when a speaker shows me that these are noble dispositions and that it is my duty to feel them, or when he exclaims against me for my indifference and coldness. He must describe the kindness and tenderness of my friend; he must set before me the distress suffered by the person for whom he would interest me; then, and not till then, my heart begins to be touched, my gratitude or my compassion begins to glow²²

21 Supra, p. 87

22 Blair, Lecture 32, quoted in Coppens, op. cit., p. 177.

This presentation is an elaborate, forceful, detailed description of a person, a place, or a thing; it is called a word-picture or tableau. It is based on the fact that the readiest way to reach the hearts of the auditors is through the imagination.

Abundant use of this figure would be expected in Chrysostom. The several such passages below have been selected as the most representative. Perhaps those about avarice are most powerful. One such passage in Homily eighty describes the covetous man. Such an one cannot find peace in leading an army, nor in guiding a people, nor in managing a household. Not even if he be king:

For should he be a king, he is still the most wretched of men, and a pest to the world, and the poorest of all. For he will feel like a commoner, not accounting all men's possessions to be his, but thinks himself to have less than any. For measuring the things present by his desire for those whereof he is not yet possessed, he will account the former nothing compared to the latter. Such a one sets himself for sale; and goes about, a common enemy of the world, grieving that the earth does not bear gold instead of corn, and fountains bear only streams, and mountains only stones; vexed at the fruitfulness of the seasons, troubled at common benefits; shunning every means whence one cannot obtain money; undergoing any thing whence he can scrape together the smallest sum of money; hating all men, the poor, and the rich; the poor, lest they should come and beg of him; the rich, because he has not got their possessions. All men he accounts to be possessed of what is his, and as though he had been injured by all, so is he displeased with all. He knows not plenty, he has no experience of satiety, he is more wretched than any. Just as, on the other hand, he that is freed from these things, and practises self-restraint, is the most enviable. For the virtuous man, though he be a servant, though a prisoner is the most happy of men. For no one shall do him ill, no not though all men should come together out of the world, setting in motion arms and camps, and warring with him. But he that is depraved and vile, and such as we have described, though he be a king, though he have on a thousand diadems, will suffer the utmost extremities, even from a common hand. So feeble is vice, so strong is virtue.²³

²³ Homily 80, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1066. Note here the use of the epigram. It is generally used at the end of a paragraph to sum up the

A pathetic description of the miserable army of which he is the general undoubtedly presented a moving picture to his hearers in Homily 88:

When you are not yet sound, how can any one arm you for the fight? How should he lead you still having wounds and gashes? . . . How then shall we with confidence show you in the battle array, when you rather do us mischief, being straightway wounded by our enemies, and made a mock of? For one man's hand is diseased, and shrunk so as not to be able to give away [i.e., practise almsgiving]. How then should such a one hold a shield, and thrust it before him, and avoid being wounded by the jeers of cruelty. With others the feet halt, as many as go up to the theatre and to the resorts of the prostitutes. How then shall these be able to stand in the battle and not be wounded with the accusation of wantonnes. Another suffers and is maimed in his eyes, not looking straight, but being full of lasciviousness, and assailing women's chastity, and overthrowing marriages. How then should this man be able to look in the face of the enemy, and brandish a spear, and throw his dart, being goaded on all sides with jeers. We may see also many suffering with the belly not less than the dropsical, when they are held in subjection by gluttony and drunkenness. How then shall this man ever shout in battle, and achieve anything great and noble, he too being drunk with another drunkenness, and affording much laughter to the enemy? Therefore, each day I go about this camp, dressing your wounds, healing your sores. But if you ever rouse yourselves up, and become fit even to wound others, I will both teach you this art of war, and instruct you how to handle these weapons, or rather your works will themselves be weapons to you, and all men will immediately submit, if you would become merciful, if forbearing, if mild and patient, if you would show forth all other virtue. But . . . now we rather are hindered (at least as to your part) in this race.²⁴

Their hearts are like the tablets on which children learn to write--Homily eleven:

For if we, when sending children to teachers see them reaping no benefit thereby, begin to be severe in blaming the teachers, and remove them to others; what excuse shall we have for not bestowing upon virtue even so much diligence as upon these earthly things, but forever bringing our tablets home empty? And yet our Teachers here are more in number and greater. For no less than Prophets and Apostles and Patriarchs, and all

thought in a pointed form. A truth thus vested will be brief and balanced; it may be metaphorical, and often is antithetical. Cf. Infra, p. 142

righteous men, are by us set over you as teachers in every Church. . . . Therefore, wipe out the letters, or rather the impressions, which the Devil has engraven in your soul; and bring me a heart set free from worldly tumults, that without fear I may write on it what I will. Since now at least there is nothing else to discern, except his letters; rapines, covetings, envy, jealousy. Wherefore, when I receive your tablets, I cannot even read them. For I find not those letters, which we inscribe on you every Sunday; but others--unintelligible and misshapen. Then, when we have blotted them out, and have written those which are of the Spirit, when you depart, and give up your hearts to the works of the Devil, you give him again power to substitute his own characters in you. What will be the end of all this, each man's own conscience knows. For I indeed will not cease to do my part, and to write in you the right letters. But if you mar our diligence, for our part our reward is unaltered, but your danger is not small. . . . Now, I beseech again and entreat you, imitate at least the little children's diligence in these matters. For they first learn the form of the letters, after that they practise themselves in distinguishing them put out of shape, and then at last they proceed to their reading. Just so let us also do; let us divide virtue, and learn first not to swear, nor to speak evil; then proceeding to another row, not to envy, not to lust, not to be gluttonous, not to be drunken, not fierce, nor slothful . . . and let us join these one with another, and write them upon our soul.²⁵

Life is compared to the sea in Homily 81:

Therefore, I beseech you . . . to give an opposite direction to the passions that come upon us in every age. For if in every part of our life we sail past the harbors of virtue, everywhere undergoing shipwrecks, when we have arrived at the harbor destitute of spiritual freight, we shall undergo extreme punishment. For our present life is an outstretched ocean. And as in the sea here, there are different bays exposed to different tempests, and the Aegean is difficult because of the winds, the Tyrrhenian strait because of the shallows, the Propontis, which is without the Euxine sea, on account of its violence and currents, the parts without Cadiz because of the desolation, and tracklessness, and unexplored places therein, and other portions for other causes; so also it is in our life. . . . And the first sea to view is that of our childish days, having much tempestuousness, because of its folly, its facility, because it is not steadfast. Therefore also we set over it guides and teachers, by our diligence adding what is wanting to nature, even as there by the pilot's skill. . . . After this age succeeds the sea of the youth, where the winds are violent as in the Aegean, lust increasing upon us. And this age especially is destitute of correction; not only because he is beset more fiercely, but also

because his faults are not reprov'd, for both teacher and guide withdrew. When therefore the winds blow more fiercely, and the pilot is more feeble, and there is no helper, consider the greatness of the tempest. After this there is again another period of life, that of men, in which the cares of the household press upon us, when there is a wife and marriage, and begetting of children, and ruling of a house, and thick falling showers of cares. Then especially both covetousness flourishes and envy. . . . When then we pass each part of our life with shipwrecks, how shall we suffice for the present life? How shall we escape future punishment? For when first in the earliest age we learn nothing healthful, and then in youth we do not practise sobriety, and when grown to manhood do not get the better of covetousness, coming to old age as to a hold full of bilgewater, and as having made the bark of the soul weak by all these shocks, the planks being separated, we shall arrive at that harbor, bearing much filth instead of spiritual merchandise, and to the Devil we shall furnish laughter, but lamentation to ourselves, and bring upon ourselves the intolerable punishment.²⁶

Description of the covetous with a word picture of one possessed in Homily eighty-one:

We bring forward the possessed and the covetous, and make a comparison between the two. . . . The possessed was never clad with garments, cutting himself with stones; and running, he rushes over rough paths, driven headlong by the devil. Do not these things seem to be dreadful? What then, if I shall show the covetous doing more grievous things than these to their own soul, and to such a degree more grievous, that these are considered child's play compared with those? For indeed they are more objects of shame than ten thousand naked persons. For it were far better to be naked as to clothing, than being clad with the fruits of covetousness, to go about like them that celebrate the orgies for Bacchus, wearing madmen's masks and clothes. "But these tear their clothes to pieces." And how readily would every one of those that are injured consent that his garment should be torn, rather than be stripped of all his substance? "But these bite not with the teeth." Would that it were with teeth, and not with the darts of covetousness fiercer than teeth. For who will feel most pained, he that was bitten once, and straightway healed, or he that is forever eaten by the teeth of penury? For penury when involuntary is more grievous than a furnace or a wild beast. . . . "But they do not pelt with stones them that meet them." And what is this? Of stones it were easy to beware; but of the wounds which by paper and ink they work to the wretched poor, (framing writings full of blows without number), who can ever easily beware?

And let us also see what they do to themselves. They walk naked up and down the city, for they have no garment of virtue. But this does not seem to them to be a disgrace, for they have no feeling of the unseen-ness; but while they are ashamed of having their body naked, they bear about the soul naked, and glory in it. And if you wish, I will tell you also the cause of their insensibility. What then is the cause? They are naked amongst many that are thus naked, wherefore neither are they ashamed, just as neither are we in the baths. So that if indeed there were many clothed with virtue, then would their shame appear more. But now this above all is a worthy subject for many tears, that because the bad are many, bad things are not even esteemed as a disgrace. . . . That they are more naked than the possessed is evident from these things, and that they go into the deserts, neither this can anyone deny. For the wide and broad way is more desert than any desert. For although it have many that journey on it, yet none from amongst men, but serpents, scorpions, wolves, adders, and asps. Such are they that practise wickedness. And this way is not only desert, but much more rugged than that [of the mad]. For stones and ravines and crags do not so wound those that mount them, as robbery and covetousness the souls that practise them.

And that they live by the tombs, like the possessed, or rather that they themselves are tombs, is plain by this. What is a tomb? A stone having a dead body lying in it. Wherein then do these men's bodies differ from those stones? or rather, they are more miserable even than they. For it is not a stone containing a dead body, but a body more insensible than stones, bearing about a dead soul. Wherefore one would not be wrong in calling them tombs. . . . Would you that I show next, how they also cut their heads with stones? For are not anxieties more grievous than many stones, not wounding heads, but consuming the soul? For they are afraid, lest those things should justly go forth out of their house, which have come to them unjustly; they tremble in fear of the utmost ills, are angry, are provoked, against those of their own house, against strangers; and now despondency, now fear, now wrath, comes upon them in succession, and they are as if they were crossing precipice after precipice, and they are earnestly looking day by day for what they have not yet acquired. Wherefore neither do they feel pleasure in the things they have, both by reason of not feeling confidence about the security of them, and because with their whole mind they are intent upon what they have not yet seized.

And like as one continually thirsting, though he should drink up ten thousand fountains, feeleth not the pleasure, because he is not satisfied; so also these, so far from feeling pleasure, are even tormented, the more they heap around themselves; from their not feeling any limit to such desire.²⁷

A description of the soul's beauty in Homily 34:

For it is not the body wherein beauty lies, but in the expression and the bloom which is shed over its substance by the soul. Now then, I bid you love that which makes the body also to appear such as it is. . . . For when she is pleased, she showers roses over the cheeks; and when she is pained, she takes that beauty, and involves it all in a dark robe. And if she is continually in mirth, the body improves in condition; if in grief, she renders the same thinner and weaker than a spider's web: if in wrath, she makes it again abominable and foul; if she shows the eye calm, great is the beauty she bestows; if she expresses envy, very pale and livid is the hue she sheds over us; if love, abundant the gracefulness she at once confers. Thus in fact many women, not being beautiful in feature, have derived much grace from the soul; others again of brilliant bloom, by having an ungracious soul, have marred their beauty. Consider how a face that is pale grows red, and by the variation of color produces great delight, when there is need of shame and blushing. As, on the other hand, if it be shameless, it makes the countenance more displeasing than any monster.

For nothing is fairer, nothing sweeter than a beauteous soul. For while as to bodies, the longing is with pain, in the case of souls the pleasure is pure and calm. Why then let go the king, and be wild about the herald? Why leave the philosopher, and gape after his interpreter? Hast thou seen a beautiful eye? Acquaint yourself with that which is within; and if that be not beautiful, despise this likewise. For surely, if you were to see an ugly woman wearing a beautiful mask, she would make no impression on you: just as on the other hand, neither would you let one fair and beautiful to be disguised by the mask, but would take it away, wishing to see her beauty unveiled.

This then I bid you do in regard to the soul also, and acquaint yourself with it first; for this clad with body instead of a mask; wherefore also that abides such as it is; but the other, though it be misshapen, may quickly become beautiful. Though it have an eye that is unsightly, and harsh, and fierce, it may become beautiful, mild, calm, sweet-tempered, gentle. . . .28

Description of the procedure to be followed when sick in soul--in Homily 74:

Let us also then, while in sickness, send for physicians, and lay out money, and exert unceasing diligence, that having risen up from our affliction, we may depart hence in health. And as much care as we exert about our servants when their bodies are sick, so much let us show forth

upon ourselves, when our soul is diseased. For in truth we are nearer to ourselves than our servants, and our souls are more necessary than their bodies and this is the amazing thing: we hold ourselves in so little esteem that we despise ourselves more than our servants. For when our servants are sick with a fever, we send for physicians, and make a separation in the house, and compel them to obey the laws of that art; and if these are neglected, we are displeased with them, and set persons to watch them, who will not, even should they wish them to, let them satiate their desire; and if they who have the care of these persons should say, that medicines must be procured at great cost, we yield; and whatsoever they enjoin, we obey, and we pay them hire for these injunctions. But when we are sick (or rather there is no time when we are not sick), we do not so much as call in a physician, we do not lay out money, but as though some ruffian, and enemy, and foe, were concerned, so do we disregard our soul. And these things I say, not finding fault with our attention towards our servants, but thinking it meet to take at least as much care of our souls. And how should we do? one may say. Show it to Paul when ill; call in Matthew; let John sit by it. Hear from them, what he ought to do that is thus ill; they will surely tell, and will not conceal. For they are not dead, but live and speak. But does the soul give no heed to them being weighed down by the fever? Then compel it! and awaken its reasoning power. Call in the prophets. There is no need to pay money to these physicians, for neither do they themselves demand hire for themselves, nor for the medicines which they prepare. . . . Sit down therefore by them, and learn of them the nature of thy disease. For instance, do you love wealth, and greedy gain like the fevered love water? Just as the physician says to you: "If you will gratify your desire, you will perish," so also Paul . . . But he does not forbid only, but also soothes, as a physician should. And just as they devise some other things in the place of cold things, so does this man draw off the desire another way. Do you wish to be rich, says he; let it be "in good works." Do you desire to lay up treasure? I forbid it not at all; only let it be in Heaven. . . . Do you want to call in also another physician? To me at least it seems well. For neither are these physicians like those of the body, who often, while vying one with another, overwhelm the sick man. But not so these, for they have regard to the health of the sick, not to their own reputation. Be not afraid then of the number of them; One Master speaks in all, that is Christ. . . .²⁹

But Cf. also the following:

The Church is described in terms of a home--Homily 32.

Anger is described as a flame consuming everything --Homily 16.

The tongue is pictured as a royal steed in need of bridling and pacing for the King to take His seat thereon --Homily 51.

The life of man is compared to the play of children --Homily 23.

A forceful description of the monks victorious in the battle against the vices --Homily 70.

Virtue is described as the face of a beautiful woman in Homily 47, and poverty as a beautiful girl --Homily 90.

A detailed contrast is presented between the rich and the poor man, and again between the proud and the humble man --Homily 23.

A vivid description is painted of the City of Gold --Homily 1.

Whereas the tableaux attempt to describe the scene--the person, place, or thing--vividly, the figure, prosopopoeia, represents a real or imaginary person as speaking directly. It is used continually. The quotations from Sacred Scripture are almost never made simply that "the Bible tells us". . . but "Isaias," or "David," or "St. Matthew," or "Our Lord" says. . . . The dramatic nature of this figure always imparts a great deal of vivacity to the discourse. For prosopopoeia without scriptural text there are abundant examples in what Christ or God might say to the Jews, to His disciples, to us, to the wicked, to the good, and so on. For example, Homily 90--Christ is represented as saying to the disciples:

"For the irksome things that you will undergo are finished together with the present life, since at least even this world itself shall come to an end, but the good things which you shall enjoy remain immortal, as I have often told you before." Thus having invigorated and roused their minds, He sent them forth.³⁰

Another example of this dramatic narration may be cited from Homily 35 where Chrysostom tells us what God did not say, what we do say, and what the idle young man answers:

³⁰ Homily 90, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1171

Yet God never told us, "Because you are idle, I will not light up the sun for you; because you do nothing of real consequence, I will dim the moon, I will paralyze the earth, I will restrain the lakes, the fountains, the rivers, I will blot out the atmosphere, I will withhold the annual rains." But He gives us all abundantly, and not only when we are idle, but even when we do evil. When therefore, you see a poor man, and say, "It stops my breath that this fellow, young as he is and healthy, having nothing, would fain be fed in idleness; he is surely some slave and runaway, and has deserted his proper master," I bid you to speak these same words to yourself. Or rather, permit him to speak them freely to you, and he will say with more justice: "It stops my breath, that you, being healthy, are idle, and practise none of the things which God commanded, but having run away from the commandments of your Lord, go about dwelling in wickedness, as in a strange land, in drunkenness, in surfeiting, in theft, in extortion, in subverting other men's houses."³¹

Forceful expression is also achieved by the paradox, which was treated under Variety, and the hyperbole which consists of extreme exaggeration.

Typical hyperboles are the following:

- Homily 6: They must be worthy of ten thousand deaths. . . .³²
- Homily 23: Though one suppose ten thousand hells . . .³³
To endure a thousand thunderbolts . . .³⁴
- Homily 32: We are not comparable to their shadows . . .³⁵
- Homily 33: Undergoing temptations without number like sleet . . .³⁶
- Homily 34: In grief she renders the body thinner and weaker than a spider's web . . .³⁷
- Homily 81: Thirsty, though we should drink up ten thousand fountains of water . . .³⁸

31 Homily 35, Prevost, op. cit., v. 2, p. 515

32 Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 91

33 Homily 23, ibid., p. 359

34 Ibid., eodem loco.

35 Homily 32, ibid., p. 476

36 Homily 33, ibid., p. 492

37 Homily 34, ibid., p. 505

38 Homily 81, ibid., v. 3, p. 1078

A good example of extended hyperbolic speech is this paragraph from Homily thirty-three:

With none to make war we are slain; we faint when no man pursues, in peace we are required to be saved, and even for this we are not sufficient. And they indeed, when the whole world was on fire, and the pile was being kindled over the whole earth, entering, snatched from within, out of the midst of the flame, such as were burning; but you are not able so much as to preserve yourself. . . .³⁹

But it must be remembered that the presentation of tableaux and dramatic narrations and hyperbolic speech, while they do arouse the feelings by presenting the proper object of the emotion as forcefully as possible, yet after all they are only the indirect pathetic. There is the pathos proper--the direct pathetic--the utterance of the orator's excited emotions. This is the final test of oratory. If an orator can do this well, he is no common orator. Here passion is excited by contagion. Cicero expresses himself thus:

Ut enim nulla materies tam facilis ad exardescendum est, quae nisi admoto igni ignem concipere possit, sic nulla mens est tam ad comprehendendam vim oratoris parata, quae possit incendi, nisi ipse inflammatur ad eam et ardens accesserit.⁴⁰

The same rule that Horace gives for tragedians, "Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi,"⁴¹ holds here as regards public speakers. This rule applies directly to those passions that are aroused by sympathy.

39 Homily 33, Prevost, op. cit., v. 2, p. 489

40 Cicero, De Oratore, II, 45. Sutton, op. cit., p. 335: "For just as there is no substance so ready to take fire, as to be capable of generating flame without the application of a spark, so also there is no mind so ready to absorb an orator's influence, as to be inflammable when the assailing speaker is not himself aglow with passion."

41 "If you wish me to weep, you must first be afflicted yourself." Horace, Ars Poetica, Epistles II, 3, line 102.

The chief means for uttering direct pathos is the Rhetorical Question, the Exclamation, and the Apostrophe. The rhetorical question is asked for effect--it arouses sorrow, admiration, indignation, contempt--it is short and rapid--and has an exciting effect on the audience. It is especially effective when accumulated. Chrysostom uses it lavishly. It seems if he asks one, he cannot resist asking two or three more. The figure appears several times in each homily. As examples we have chosen the following:

You have your Debtor; why leave Him, and require it of me, a poor and wretched mortal? What? is that Debtor displeased, when the debt is required of Him? What? is He poor? Is He unwilling to pay? Do you not see His unspeakable treasures? Do you not see His indescribable munificence? . . .⁴²

For how, I ask, did the disciples steal Him, men poor and unlearned, and not venturing so much as to show themselves? What? was not a seal put upon it? What were there not so many watchmen, and soldiers, and Jews stationed round it? What? did not those men suspect this very thing, and take thought, and break their rest, and are in anxiety about it? And wherefore moreover did they steal it? That they might feign the doctrine of the Resurrection? And how should it enter their minds to feign such a thing, men who were well content to be hidden and to live? And how could they remove the stone that was made sure? How could they have escaped the observation of so many? Nay, though they had despised death, they would not have attempted without purpose, and fruitlessly to venture in defiance of so many who were on the watch. . . .⁴³

Related to the oratorical question in purpose, and almost as frequent in Chrysostom, is the exclamation. It too arouses the emotions and brings them in harmony with those of the speaker. St. Francis de Sales says, "It is desirable to have in readiness certain familiar exclamations and to utter them judiciously and in the proper place, as: O God! Goodness of God!

⁴² Homily 15, Prevost, op. cit., v. 1, p. 217

⁴³ Homily 90, ibid., v. 3, pp. 1167-1168

What then! Alas! Ah! My God!"⁴⁴ Thus also Chrysostom punctuates his thoughts in each of the homilies with such expressions as: O blindness! O insensibility! O man! O wretched man! O greatness of mind! What then! O goodness! O love of God toward man! O exceeding love to man! in such sentences as, "Behold, O wretched man, the measure of your belly!"

The apostrophe is a figure by which the speaker addresses directly persons not present. The figure is not frequent, because Chrysostom is too busy addressing himself to the people present. But an example from Homily 87 will not be out of place. Chrysostom had just described the scene where the Jews mock Our Lord because He could not save Himself on the Cross.

Chrysostom addresses the Jews:

O execrable! most execrable! What, were not the prophets prophets, nor the righteous men righteous, because God did not rescue them out of their dangers. Nay surely they were, though suffering these things. What then could be equal to your folly? For if the coming of the dangers upon them did not injure their honor with you, how much more in the case of This Man, was it wrong for you to be offended, when both by what He did, and by what He said, He was ever correcting beforehand this suspicion of yours.⁴⁵

It is not sufficient, however, to make a single forceful statement. A momentary excitement, like a photographer's flash, leaves no lasting impression on the senses. The feeling must be prolonged to decide the action of the will. And for this is the device of accumulation. It sweeps the audience like an avalanche--whipping their emotions tauter and tauter, until

⁴⁴ St. Francis, Letter on Preaching. Translated by Boyle, Instructions on Preaching (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902) p. 69.

⁴⁵ Homily 87, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1139

almost the breaking point. The accumulation takes a simple figure and hammers it home. It may or may not be climactic. As examples of accumulation without climax the following will serve from Homily 6:

And this when we see Paul soaring above the Heaven, and the Heaven of Heaven, and more fervent than any flame, conquering and over-passing all things, the things beneath, and the things above; the things present, and the things to come; the things that are, and the things that are not. . . .⁴⁶

And again from the same homily:

Yes for a grievous conflict is at hand, and against the powers unseen is our wrestling; against the spiritual wickednesses our fight, against principalities, against powers our warfare: and it is well for us, if when we are earnest and sober and thoroughly awakened, we can be able to sustain the savage phalanx. . . .⁴⁷

From Homily 76 comes this passage:

But if any man disbelieve the judgments to come, let him look at the things here, at those in the prisons, those in the mines, those on the dunghills, the possessed, the frantic, those that are struggling with incurable diseases, those that are fighting against continual poverty, those that live in famine, those that are pierced with irremediable woes, those in captivity.⁴⁸

Accumulation when connected with Epanaphora achieves poetic beauty and passionate intensity. Epanaphora is a figure in which the same word or group of words is repeated at the beginning of successive cola. One of the best examples of this occurs in Homily 23. Chrysostom presents Our Lord addressing us:

Me, who brought thee from that which is not into being, Who breathed into thee a soul, and set thee over all things on earth, Who for thy sake made earth, and heaven, and sea, and air, and all things that are,

⁴⁶ Homily 6, Prevost, op. cit., p. 86

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 89

⁴⁸ Homily 76, ibid., v. 3, p. 1018

Who had been dishonored by thee, yea, accounted of less honor than the devil, and did not even so withdraw Himself, but had innumerable thoughts for you after it all; Who chose to become a slave, Who was beaten with rods and spit upon, Who was slain, Who died the most shameful death, Who also on high makes intercession for thee, Who freely gives thee His Spirit, Who vouchsafes to thee a kingdom, . . . Who has brought thee out of darkness into the dominion of light.⁴⁹

In connection with cumulative development two figures are to be considered: the polysyndeton and the asyndeton. The former by accumulation of connectives results in a dignified movement. We repeat here the example from Homily 32 which we have quoted under the figure of metonymy:

But we, when we have the same City, and the same House, and Table, and Way, and Door, and Root, and Life, and Head, and the same Shepherd, and King, and Teacher, and Judge, and Maker, and Father, to whom all things are common, what indulgence can we deserve, if we be divided one from another?⁵⁰

Homily 43: Have we not had enough of indolence, mirth, procrastination? Will it not be the same over again, feasting, and surfeittings, and expense, and wealth, and acquisitions, and buildings? And what is the end? Death. What is the end? Ashes, and dust, and coffins, and worms.⁵¹

Asyndeton, on the other hand, makes for very rapid movement by omitting the connectives between the several parts. We quote an example from Homily 70:

The clamor. . . in the soul, that brings on them a great captivity, the tumults of the thoughts, the sleet, the darkness, the tempest, by which all things are mingled and confused, and are like to some night battle. . . .⁵²

Homily 70: From the monks let us learn to set before ourselves a table full of countless blessings, most sweet, without cost, delivered from

49 Homily 23, Prevost, op. cit., p. 359

50 Homily 32, ibid., v. 2, p. 476

51 Homily 43, ibid., v. 3, p. 606

52 Homily 70, ibid., p. 950

care, free from envy and jealousy and every disease, and full of good hope and having its many trophies. No turmoil of soul there, no sorrow, nor wrath; all is calm, all is peace.⁵³

More often he combines both with good effect:

Homily 81: There, gnashing of teeth, and outer darkness, and the fire prepared for the Devil, and to be cut asunder, and to be driven away; here, enmities, evilspeakings, slanders, perils, cares, plots, to be hated of all, to be abhorred of all, even of the very persons who seem to flatter us.⁵⁴

Movement

Thus far two qualities have been analyzed: emphasis and vigor-- which a style must have ut veritas moveat. There remains but to consider the third: the movement or progress of a composition. The thought should march purposively to its goal. A great author is known by the march of his elocution, Newman tells us. From the introduction the sermon progresses surely and smoothly to the end. Semper crescat oratio. There is no let down, it does not flatten out. Through all the units, the thought is arranged in ascending order. Suspense is present in periodic sentence, paragraph, and composition structure. The climax or outcome is hinted at, but not given away prematurely. There are also minor climaxes and strong points to a sermon as to a play. As Adams remarks,

Climax is the universal key to all oratorical composition. It applies to the discourse as a whole; it applies to every sentence as a part, The ideas of the audience should be kept in a constantly ascending state, though it is not always necessary that the ascent should be made by regular and artificial steps.⁵⁵

53 Homily 70, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 950

54 Homily 81, ibid., p. 1079

55 Adams, Lecture 24, quoted in Coppens, op. cit., p. 188.

Thus movement is achieved mainly through the use of the general figure of climax and of such figures as the question and answer, the hypophora, and the prokataleipsis. These latter three have been treated more or less adequately under clearness.⁵⁶

Various types of climactic development are found in Chrysostom--from the very simple climax in a single sentence--to complicated climaxes lasting for several paragraphs. Thus:

Homily 15: What! is it a bear that is fighting? a wild beast? a serpent? It is a man, one who hath in every respect fellowship with you: a Brother, a Member!⁵⁷

Homily 19: For when prophets are chanting, and apostles singing hymns, and God is discoursing, we wander without, and bring in upon us a turmoil of worldly business.⁵⁸

Homily 34: Yea, many of the same age with her whom he loves, and oftentimes also fairer, being dead, after the first or second day, have emitted an ill odor, and foul matter, and decay with worms.⁵⁹

Homily 49: But what is wonderful, is to enjoy a calm amidst waves, and in a furnace not to be burnt, and in youth not to run wanton. . . .⁶⁰

Homily 81: Such is covetousness, it renders men fools and senseless, yea reckless, and dogs instead of men, or rather much fiercer than dogs, and devils after being dogs.⁶¹

Homily 76 illustrates powerful climax in conjunction with an accumulation of rhetorical questions, followed by a climactic answer. These same lines formed the basis of the magnificent oration Pro Eutropio:

⁵⁶ Supra, pp.

⁵⁷ Homily 15, Prevost, op. cit., p. 219

⁵⁸ Homily 19, ibid., p. 303

⁵⁹ Homily 34, ibid., v. 2, p. 504

⁶⁰ Homily 49, ibid., v. 2, p. 677

⁶¹ Homily 81, ibid., v. 3, p. 1074

Has not every art an end? It is surely plain to every one. Then show me the end of your worldly eagerness. But you cannot; for "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." Let us go to the tombs; show me your father; show me your wife. Where is he that was clad in raiment of gold? he that rode in the chariot? he that had armies, that had the badge, that had the heralds? he that was slaying these, and casting those into prison? He that put to death whom he would, and set free whom he wanted? I see nothing but bones, and a worm, and a spider's web; all those things are earth, all those a fable, all a dream, and a shadow, and a bare relation, and a picture, or rather not even a picture. For in the picture we see at least a likeness, but here not even a likeness.⁶²

As the final illustration for this chapter on emphasis, vigor, and movement there could be no better quotation than this one from an extremely vehement sermon which Chrysostom preached against the Circus in 399, perhaps on Easter Day. It is not from the series on St. Matthew, but it is an excellent example of his other homilies. It begins with antithetical pathos, followed by rhetorical questions for direct pathos. Then a series of beautiful accumulated parisons with epanaphora and a climactic contrast. Nor does it end in admonition but in the most solemn threat possible--that of excommunication, with a repetition of it for emphasis. The background of the sermon was that the rain had been so heavy that the crops were endangered, and Chrysostom had arranged public processions of prayer to certain churches. The rain stopped, and on the next two days (which may have been Good Friday and Holy Saturday) the people rushed off in troops to the races,

. . . while I, your bishop, sitting at home and hearing the noise, suffered worse agonies than in a storm at sea. . . . Are these things to be borne? Can they be tolerated? . . . For you the sun rose, the moon shone, choirs of stars spangled the night sky; for you the winds blew and rivers ran, seeds took root and plants grew; for you the whole course of nature kept its due order; and you, with all creation minis-

62 Homily 76, Prevost, op. cit., v. 3, p. 1018

tering to your needs, you run after the Devil's pleasures! . . .⁶³ I declare that if anyone after this warning absents himself from the fold to go after the poisonous vice of the theatre, I will not allow him inside these rails. I shall refuse the Holy Mysteries to him!⁶³

⁶³ Attwater, op. cit., p. 86

CONCLUSION

St. John Chrysostom has been esteemed in his own day and succeeding ages as the greatest orator of the Eastern Church. As to the detailed characteristics of his oratory, however, there has not been general agreement. It has been more or less common doctrine that Chrysostom broke entirely with the pagan tradition of oratory. More recent investigations¹ have shown that in sentence structure and in the use of figures and other ornaments of style he was a true child of his age--a Christian orator speaking with all the art of the pagan. He could not shed the influence of the Second Sophistic, so he used it to dress and express the sublime truths of Christianity.

The success of his preaching is chiefly due to (1) his whole-hearted earnestness and conviction with which he delivered the message he felt had been given him; (2) his natural facility of speech, which was extraordinary even to the Greeks; and (3) the abundance of his thoughts as well as the popular way of presenting and illustrating them.

Thus the first factor in Chrysostom's phenomenal success was his ethos: the sum total of those qualities by which a given speaker proves

¹ Published by the Catholic University of America Press, in Washington, D. C.: T. E. Ameringer, The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom, 1921; M. A. Burns, St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues: A Study of their Rhetorical Qualities and Form, 1930; W. A. Maat, A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio, 1944.

himself worthy of credence, and by which he attains a measure of persuasion even before he begins to speak. Emerson² said that the reason why people refuse to accept us as bringers of truth is that while we think we have it they feel we have not. And Cicero³ long before him claimed that success in speaking depended on the character of the speaker's life. And Aristotle⁴ before him postulated three sources of success in persuasion, one of them being the moral character of the man. Hence the ethos of the speaker is of great importance.

It is of still greater importance in the case of the preacher. It consists in apostolic zeal and a virtuous life; the minister must prove his words by his deeds. The golden mouth here is of little avail unless it belong to a golden man. Such a man creates a strong impression on even the most indifferent audience. Such a man is ready to sacrifice his life for his words. Such a man was Chrysostom, as even the brief sketch of his life must show. In his case it was the man who gave power to the oration.

His physical appearance added little to his influence as a preacher. Like so many men who have possessed great powers of command over the minds of others, for example, St. Paul, St. Athanasius, he was short in stature; his frame was attenuated by the austerities of his youth, and his habitually ascetic mode of life; his cheeks were pale and hollow; his eyes deeply set, but bright and piercing; his broad and lofty forehead was furrowed by

2 Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 383

3 Cicero, De Oratore, II, 43. Sutton, op. cit., pp. 327, 329.

4 Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 384

wrinkles; his head was bald. He frequently delivered his discourses sitting in the ambo or high reading desk, just inside the nave, in order to be near his hearers and well raised above them.⁵

But these physical disadvantages were more than compensated by his other qualities. He was a faithful and courageous preacher of truth and righteousness and told fearlessly the whole duty of man. He was absorbed in that practical Christianity which proves itself in holy living and dying. So he preached virtue and morals rather than dogma and theology. Because he was not interested in metaphysical speculations, he made little use of philosophical terms, yet he was invoked in his own and later centuries in both East and West by all defenders of the faith. He was a martyr to the pulpit--for it was chiefly his faithful preaching that caused his exile. In Canto xii of the Paradiso Dante assigns to Chrysostom a place in fourth heaven between Nathan the prophet and Anselm the theologian--because like Nathan he rebuked the court, and like Anselm he suffered exile for his conviction.⁶

One of his distinguishing qualities was a copia verborum. His treasury of words and phrases was inexhaustible, and language streamed from his lips like a full, rich flood. Extempore remarks were called forth by the behavior of the congregation. When they applauded him, he would denounce them but in the very midst of his rebuke he became so eloquent, that the audience

5 Stephens, op. cit., p. 425

6 Schaff, op. cit., p. 57

applauded again.⁷ And the same was true when they were not attentive. Or even when they laughed. Suidas observes that he "had a tongue which exceeded the cataracts of the Nile in fluency, so that he delivered many of his panegyrics on the martyrs without least hesitation."⁸

Although his style is exuberantly rich, yet seldom is it offensively redundant, for every word is usually telling; and at times he is epigrammatically terse. A few instances will suffice: The fire of sin is large but it is quenched by a few tears. . . . Pain was given on account of sin yet through pain sin is dissolved. . . . Riches are called possessions, that we may possess them, not be possessed by them. . . . Throughout we feel his easy, conversational style, and before we are aware he has risen to fierce denunciation, vehement exhortation, and touching appeal. Yet in his highest flights of eloquence he never gives the impression that he was declaiming and not teaching. There is no suggestion of hysteria. Though highly dramatic, he remains forceful and persuasive, unconstrained and natural, and passages of easy familiarity are equally characteristic of him.

Finally, a remarkable profusion of images, examples and comparisons contributed much to the variety of style, the clearness and force which characterize his discourse. This is evidenced from the readiness by which he laid hold of passing events such as lighting the lamps in the church as he was speaking to illustrate or enforce his theme. In this graphic speech from short lightning flashes of metaphors and similes to the noon-day brilliance of tableaux he is rivalled by no peer.

7 Hubbell, op. cit., p. 263

8 Stephens, op. cit., p. 427

To this personal ethos, fluency of language, and profusion of illustration, add the fulness of Scriptural knowledge as evidenced in countless quotations, add the ability to bring the thought of the Gospels into touch with the life of his own time and of every age, add the elegance and rhythmic flow of his Greek style reflected in his lavish use of all types of parallelism, add the dramatic vigor of his abundant figures of rhetorical question, prosopopoeia, and *dialektikon*, and you have the outstanding feature of the homilies on St. Matthew.

But, you must add too the magnetism of his profound sympathy with his hearers. He saw man's weakness and wickedness perfectly clearly, but equally he saw God's willingness to raise him, and man's ability to cooperate. "God, the lover of man" is his favorite expression. Perhaps nowhere in all prose literature is this yearning of God for man and man's tragic indifference towards God depicted more clearly or more beautifully than in Homily seventy-six. It is at once the most pathetic and sublime, simple and complex passage in the homilies. It contains *parison*, *paradox*, *prosopopoeia*, *asyndeton*, *epanaphora*, *reverse climax*, *metonymy*, *polysyndeton*, *forward climax*, *antistrophe*, *antithesis*, *accumulation*, *rhetorical question*, *metaphor*, *quotation*. It pictures the tragedy of unrequited love. It is Chrysostom. Our Lord addresses us:

"For I, so far from asking thee for a recompense of the things which I give thee, do even make Myself owe thee a recompense for this very thing: if thou be willing to use all I have.

"For I am Father, I am Brother, I am Bridegroom, I am Dwelling Place, I am Food, I am Raiment, I am Root, I am Foundation, all whatsoever thou wilt, I am.

"Be thou in need of nothing, I will be even a Servant, for I came to minister, not to be ministered unto; I am Friend, and Member, and Head, and Brother, and Sister, and Mother; I am all; only cling thou closely to Me. I was poor for thee, and a wanderer for thee, on the Cross for thee, in the tomb for thee, above I intercede for thee to the Father; on earth I am come for thy sake an Ambassador from My Father. Thou art all things to Me, brother, and joint heir, and friend, and member."

What would you more? Why do you turn away from Him, Who loves you? Why do you labor for the world? Why do you draw water into a broken cistern? For it is this to labor for the present life. Why do you comb wool into the fire? Why do you "beat the air"? Why do you "run in vain"?

With what eyes then shall we behold Christ? For if anyone could not bear to see his father, realizing that he had sinned against him, upon Him Who infinitely exceeds a father in forbearance how shall we then look? How shall we bear it? For indeed we shall stand at Christ's judgment-seat, and there will be a strict inquiry into all things.⁹

There may be more learned biblical scholars, but wherever there is exegesis dealing with the human heart, its motives, its weakness, or with grace and "love of God for men," there Chrysostom rises and remains "the Master in Israel."

⁹ Homily 76, Prevost, op. cit., p. 1017

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Chrysostom, John. The Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew. ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΥΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΥ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΕΥ-ΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΤΗΝ. Vols. 57-58 of Patrologia, Cursus Completus--Series Graeca. Paris: J. P. Migne, 1860. Cols. 1064.
- Chrysostom, John. The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Gospel of St. Matthew. (A library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, anterior to the division of the East and West.) Translated by George Prevost. Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1876. 3 vols., 1208 pp.
- Chrysostom, John. The Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew. Translated by George Prevost. Revised by M. B. Riddle. (A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Edited by Philip Schaff--Vol. X.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- Chrysostom, John. On the Priesthood. Translated by Patrick Boyle. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Book Shop, 1943. 145 pp.

II. SECONDARY SOURCES

A. LIFE

- Attwater, Donald. St. John Chrysostom: The Voice of Gold. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1939. (Science and Culture Series) 202 pp.
- Campbell, James Marshall. The Greek Fathers. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome. New York: Longmans, c. 1929.
- Cassidy, Frank Patrick. Molders of the Medieval Mind: The Influence of the Fathers of the Church on Medieval Schoolmen. St. Louis. 1944.
- Maloney, Edward R. (Editor). Defense of Eutropius by St. John Chrysostom. c. 1900. 44 pp.

- Newman, John Henry, Cardinal. Historical Sketches. London. 1881-1886. Vol. 2. 487 pp.
- Palladius. The Dialogue Concerning the Life of Chrysostom. Translated by Herbert Moore. (Translations of Christian Literature--Series I--Greek Texts.) New York: Macmillan Co. 1921. 213 pp.
- Paul, Father, O.S.F.C. Doctors of the Church. Chicago: Benziger Bros., 1931. 181 pp.
- Perthes, Frederic M. Life of John Chrysostom: Based on the investigations of Neander, Bohringer and others. Translated from German by Alvah Hovey and David Ford. Boston: John P. Jewett and Co., 1854. 239 pp.
- Sandys, John E. A History of Classical Scholarship. Second Edition. London: Cambridge University Press, 1906. 701 pp.
- Schaff, Philip. St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine. (Studies in Christian Biography.) New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1891. 158 pp.
- Socrates, Historia Ecclesiastica. Vol. 67 of Patrologiae Cursus Completus--Series Graeca. Paris: J. P. Migne, 1860. Cols. 1-842.
- Sozomen, Historia Ecclesiastica. Vol. 67 of Patrologiae Cursus Completus--Series Graeca. Paris: J. P. Migne, 1860. Cols. 843-1723.
- Stephens, W. R. W. St. John Chrysostom: His Life and Times: A Sketch of the Church and Empire in the Fourth Century. Second Edition. London: John Murray, 1880. 456 pp.

B. HOMILY

- Beecher, P. A. "Homiletics," Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: Robert Appleton Co., c. 1910. VII, 442-447.
- _____. "Homily," Catholic Encyclopedia. VII, 448-449.
- Boyle, Patrick, C. M. Instructions on Preaching, Catechising and Clerical Life, by Saints and Fathers of the Church. New York: Benziger Bros. 1902. 221 pp.
- Meyenberg, A. Homiletic and Catechetical Studies. Translated from seventh German edition by Ferdinand Brossart. New York: Frederick Pustet and Co., 1912. 845 pp.

C. RHETORIC

- Aristotle. The "Art" of Rhetoric. Translated by J. H. Freese. London: William Heinemann, Ltd. (Loeb Classical Library.) 491 pp.

- Burns, Sr. M. A., S. N. D. Saint John Chrysostom's Homilies on the Statues
A Study of Their Rhetorical Qualities and Form. Washington, D. C.:
The Catholic University of America Press, 1930.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. Brutus. Translated by G. L. Hendrickson.
Orator. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. (Loeb Classical Library)
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942. 537 pp.
- _____. De Oratore. Translated by E. Sutton and H. Rackam. Cambridge,
Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942. (Loeb Classical Library)
2 volumes.
- Coombes, William Henry. Sacred Eloquence. London: J. P. Coghlan, 1798.
343 pp.
- Coppens, Charles, S. J. The Art of Oratorical Composition: based upon the
precepts and models of the old masters. New York: Schwartz, Kirwin
and Fauss, c. 1885. 307 pp.
- Donnelly, Francis. Persuasive Speech. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons,
c. 1931. 258 pp.
- Hubbell, Harry M. "Chrysostom and Rhetoric," Classical Philology. Chicago:
The University of Chicago Press, 1924. Vol. 19, 261-276.
- Maat, William A. A Rhetorical Study of St. John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio.
Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944.
84 pp.
- Quintilian, Marcus Fabius. The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian. Trans-
lated by H. E. Butler. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921.
(Loeb Classical Library.) 4 Vol.
- Sharp, John K. Next Sunday's Sermon, Suggestions on Sermon Composition and
Delivery. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press, 1940. 324 pp.
- Thomas, Joseph M.; Manchester, Frederick A.; Scott, Franklin W. Composition
for College Students. Fourth Edition. New York: The Macmillan Co.,
1946. 760 pp.
- Thonssen, Lester; Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism--The development of
standards for rhetorical appraisal. New York: The Ronald Press Co.,
c. 1948. 542 pp.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

A LIST OF SPECIAL HOMILIES ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW

Chapter	Verse	Special Occasion	Homily
1	18-21	Vigil of Christmas	4
2	1-12	Epiphany	6, 7, 8
4	1-11	1st Sunday of Lent	13
5	1-12	All Saints	15
5	20-24	5th Sunday after Pentecost	16
6	16-21	Ash Wednesday	20
6	24-33	14th Sunday after Pentecost	21, 22
7	15-21	7th Sunday after Pentecost	23
8	1-13	3rd Sunday after Epiphany	26
8	23-27	4th Sunday after Epiphany	28
9	1-8	18th Sunday after Pentecost	29
9	18-26	23rd Sunday after Pentecost	31
11	2-10	2nd Sunday of Advent	36, 37
13	24-30	5th Sunday after Epiphany	46
13	31-35	6th Sunday after Epiphany	47
17	1-9	2nd Sunday of Lent	57
18	23-35	21st Sunday after Pentecost	61
20	1-16	Septuagesima Sunday	64
21	1-9	Palm Sunday	66
22	1-14	19th Sunday after Pentecost	69
22	15-21	22nd Sunday after Pentecost	70
22	34-36	17th Sunday after Pentecost	71
24	15-35	24th Sunday after Pentecost	76, 77
28	1-7	Holy Saturday	90
28	18-20	Trinity Sunday	90

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Henry A. Toczydowski has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Classical Languages.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

May 31, 1949.
Date

J. Herbert Abel, Ph.D.
Signature of Adviser